



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1997

No. 131

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we experience the diversity of people all about us with culture and philosophies and backgrounds representing every view, enable us to remember that each one of us has been created by You, O God, with a solidarity that transcends all our differences and all our disputes. As we represent our own aspirations and wishes, help us to understand other views and other people with the respect and consideration and esteem that we ought to have with all members of the human family. As we have one Creator and all share Your wonderful world, so may our thoughts and actions reflect the good will and respect that is Your gift to us. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 1-minutes after legislative business.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 94, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 94 when called up; and that it be in order any time on Monday, September 29, 1997, or any day thereafter, to consider the joint resolution in the House; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that the joint resolution be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman whether or not in this provision is a provision entitled 245(i), dealing with immigration?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to advise the gentleman there are several extensions of existing authorized law that are expiring, among them an extension of section 245(i) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and ask him whether there have been Members of this body who object to that and raise objections to that particular provision?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will just say to the gentleman that my office has been deluged with calls over this matter. I personally am very much concerned with it. In my district alone, we have I do not know how many cases where people are able to pay \$1,000 and extend their stay in this country, where other people coming from Italy or Ireland or other places do not have the \$1,000 and they are not allowed to.

There is something wrong with this. I just am concerned about it being in this legislation. I do not know how this shows up in a CR. We were told this would be a clean CR with no riders. I am concerned about it on behalf of about 55 Members that called in.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this particular provision was only voted on in the House of Representatives once, and when it was voted on it was rejected with a substantial margin.

Instead, this was snuck into law based on agreements made behind closed doors in conference meetings, et cetera, that it would be a temporary measure, and that this would be the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H7915

time when it would sunset. Now here we see another attempt to sneak through a major immigration loophole, which would permit tens of thousands, no, not tens of thousands, not even hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of people, to stay in this country illegally.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, let me simply attempt to clarify the record.

This authorization was included in the supplemental appropriations bill in the spring with the full knowledge of the Members of the House in order to avoid precipitous action and avoid immediate deportation of, as the gentleman has said, tens of thousands, perhaps even hundreds of thousands of people.

These are people who have been in the United States for a number of years, been here legally, presumably most of them working and paying taxes to the Treasury of the United States, and, by virtue of the expiration of previous law and change of law, were facing immediate deportation.

There has been an attempt by a number of proponents to give them an opportunity to either change the law or make their case that they should not be deported. All this provision does is extend that provision for about three weeks, so that we can determine whether or not it should be included in the long-term solution.

If the gentleman objects to this provision, it means in effect that extension will not go into effect for 3 weeks, and tens of thousands of people will face immediate deportation. It would seem that such an objection would be precipitous and unwarranted, and would cause undue hardship for a lot of innocent people. I urge the gentleman not to object.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I was notified that this is not a 3 week extension. First of all, I was notified this was not going to be in the bill; it was going to be a clean CR and this was not going to be there. I was informed 5 minutes ago as I was on the road here that it was in the bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, just to clarify the record, so the gentleman understands, the gentleman and I have had discussions about this last night, and I have to say, I did not know too much about this either.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It was not the gentleman who misinformed me.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman, because, if he will yield further, I do not intend to mislead him, but I want to make sure he fully understands the provision before us.

In the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 94, section 123 reads specifically, "Section 506(c) of Public Law 103-317 is amended by striking September 30, 1997, and inserting October 23, 1997." In effect, we are talking about a three-week extension, not any extension beyond that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. What would then happen?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It means nothing happens. We have another 3 weeks. Existing law is extended for the purposes of this continuing resolution so that we can resolve the business of the Congress and adjourn at a reasonable time this year.

If in fact the gentleman's objection is heard and this provision is struck, it means we do not have those 3 weeks to make this determination, and that immediately the Immigration and Naturalization Service has to go about the business of deporting tens of thousands of people for a short period of time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If I could be assured there would be a vote, an up or down vote on this particular issue on the floor, rather than having this included in a larger piece of legislation in which the Members of this body would not be able to express their will on this particular issue, if I could be assured that there will be an up or down vote, I would withdraw my objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I would simply say we are attempting to accommodate the authorizing committees that have direct jurisdiction over this particular law. This is not a provision that the Committee on Appropriations normally deals with. So I would not be able to give the gentleman assurances to that effect. But I am sure that under the proper circumstances, if we can have that opportunity to debate that issue in the next 3 weeks, it would be far more prudent to have that debate than the gentleman has requested than to entertain an objection at this time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply reiterate what the chairman of the committee has said. This is an effort to simply extend this, along with a number of other provisions in the law, for 3 weeks, the same as all of the other items in the CR, so that there is more opportunity to deal with the issue.

The real live consequences for people if this is not done is that persons have to leave the country and they cannot return for 2 years. That would create an unacceptable disruption of human beings' lives if in fact the Congress were to decide in 3 weeks that they were entitled to stay here.

We are not prejudging the outcome of this. The committee is simply extending it for 3 weeks so that a proper resolution can be reached.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me accept the idea that people want a proper solution to this. The proper solution was to not sneak this into law in the first place. The proper solution was to have an up or down vote on the floor on this issue.

We are not talking about just individual people's lives, we are talking

about people who came here and are here illegally in the United States of America. Most of these people were people whose visa had certain restrictions on it, and they decided just to flaunt the law and stay here illegally anyway, which gives everybody who gets a visa to come to the United States an incentive to just violate their visa agreement to come into the United States. So these are not just ordinary citizens.

However, and I would address this to the Chair, if the Chair can guarantee me there will be an up or down vote on this issue in the next 3 weeks, I will be very happy to withdraw my objection. But if the Chair, who happens to be the Speaker of the House, and we are very happy to have the Speaker with us today, cannot guarantee me that, I do not understand why I should withdraw my objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further on that point, I do not want to speak for the Speaker because he certainly speaks for himself, but we have a Committee on Rules in this House, and I can just tell the gentleman that this contentious matter will not come to the floor without a rule that would allow a vote on it. Since this is only a 3-week extension, I guess I would recommend to the gentleman, and I have some strong feelings, as he knows, about it, that he not object, and then we will speak to the Committee on the Judiciary and we will make sure it goes through regular process. I think that would give the gentleman his guarantee.

□ 0915

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I would ask the Chair whether or not this Member has a commitment that there will be an up or down vote on this issue.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not comment from the chair on that kind of question. There are procedures of the House that the gentleman has been advised of by the Committee on Rules chairman, steps that could be taken by the Committee on Rules. The gentleman has rights he can exercise as a Member, but the Chair does not engage in that kind of dialogue.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. Let me note this. I do have a commitment from the chairman of the Committee on Rules that we will have an up or down vote on this issue.

Let me remind my fellow Members, the reason why there is a problem right at this time and these people's lives face disruption is only because this body was prevented from having an up or down vote on the issue.

I am not up here to try to prevent the democratic process from working; I want the democratic process to have a chance to work. We have a right, and our constituents have a right, to have a vote on the floor on issues of this magnitude. We are talking about 400,000 people who already stayed, they overstayed their visas, or they snuck into this country, so they are here illegally, and they have applied under this

program. I was told when the one debate that we won on the floor, the one vote that there was on this was lost by the other side, that there would only be several thousand, maybe 10,000 people applying. It is a major loophole. Now, if this body wants to do that, I have no objection. Well, I would object, I would vote against it, but that is fine.

I am only asking that we put ourselves on the record for our constituents on this particular issue. That is what democracy is all about, and I have some friends here, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] who is totally on the other side on this, who I understand feels very strongly. I just think we should all be on the record in saying that, and with this agreement by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that there will be an up-or-down vote on this within the next 3 weeks.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman cannot be guaranteed a vote up or down in the next 3 weeks on it. This is a 3-week extension. If nothing is done, it expires, and the gentleman has won his case. I simply said to the gentleman that if this is going to come before the floor, we would see to it in the Committee on Rules that there would be a vote on it, if there is going to be a further extension of permanent law.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I will accept that assurance, and I hope everybody understands that we came to this point where people's lives might be disrupted because the democratic process was ignored in the past, and this thing was put into law without a vote on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1211. An act to provide permanent authority for the administration of au pair programs.

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the first nutrition program for the elderly under the Older Americans Act of 1965.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2203, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. LIVINGSTON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 105-271)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2203) "making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, for energy and water development, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, restudy of authorized projects, miscellaneous investigations, and, when authorized by laws, surveys and detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction, \$156,804,000, to remain available until expended, of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey, \$456,000;

Tampa Harbor, Alafia Channel, Florida, \$270,000;

Laulaulei, Hawaii, \$200,000;

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey, \$400,000;

Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey, \$472,000;

Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey, \$400,000;

Lower Cape May Meadows—Cape May Point, New Jersey, \$154,000;

Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, \$400,000;

Raritan Bay to Sandy Hook Bay (Cliffwood Beach), New Jersey, \$300,000;

Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey, \$500,000; and

Monongahela River, Fairmont, West Virginia, \$350,000:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$600,000 of the funds appropriated in Public Law 102-377 for the Red River Waterway, Shreveport, Louisiana, to Daingerfield, Texas, project for the feasibility phase of the Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas, study: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$470,000 of the funds appropriated herein to initiate the feasibility phase for the Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, Kentucky, study: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to use \$500,000 of the funds appropriated herein to implement section 211(f)(7) of Public Law 104-303 (110 Stat. 3684) and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor a portion of the Federal share of project costs for the Hunting Bayou element of the project for flood control, Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, Texas:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to use \$150,000 of the funds appropriated herein to implement section 211(f)(8) of Public Law 104-303 (110 Stat. 3684) and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor a portion of the Federal share of project costs for the project for flood control, White Oak Bayou watershed, Texas.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by laws; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction), \$1,473,373,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary pursuant to Public Law 99-662 shall be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, for one-half of the costs of construction and rehabilitation of inland waterways projects, including rehabilitation costs for the Lock and Dam 25, Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri; Lock and Dam 14, Mississippi River, Iowa; Lock and Dam 24, Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri; and Lock and Dam 3, Mississippi River, Minnesota, projects, and of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

Arkansas River, Tucker Creek, Arkansas, \$300,000;

Norco Bluffs, California, \$1,000,000;

San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, \$5,000,000;

Panama City Beaches, Florida, \$5,000,000;

Tybee Island, Georgia, \$2,000,000;

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, \$5,000,000;

Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana, \$3,000,000;

Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, \$3,500,000;

Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana, \$1,300,000;

Harlan, Williamsburg, and Middlesboro, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, \$26,390,000;

Martin County, Kentucky, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, \$5,000,000;

Pike County, Kentucky, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, \$5,300,000;

Town of Martin (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, \$700,000;

Salyserville, Kentucky, \$2,050,000;

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky, \$3,000,000;

Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana, \$22,920,000;

Lake Pontchartrain (Jefferson Parish) Stormwater Discharge, Louisiana, \$3,000,000;

Jackson County, Mississippi, \$3,000,000;

Natchez Bluff, Mississippi, \$4,000,000;

Pearl River, Mississippi (Walkiah Bluff), \$2,000,000;

Joseph G. Minish Passaic River Park, New Jersey, \$3,000,000;

Hudson River, Athens, New York, \$8,700,000;

Lackawanna River, Olyphant, Pennsylvania, \$1400,000;

Lackawanna River, Scranton, Pennsylvania, \$5,425,000;

Lycoming County, Pennsylvania, \$339,000;

South Central Pennsylvania Environment Improvement Program, \$30,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 shall be available only for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Lackawanna, Lycoming, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Pike, and Monroe counties in Pennsylvania in accordance with the purposes of subsection (a) and requirements of subsection (b) through (e)

of section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as amended;

Wallisville Lake, Texas, \$9,200,000;

Virginia Beach, Virginia (Reimbursement), \$925,000;

Virginia Beach, Virginia (Hurricane Protection), \$13,000,000;

West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, West Virginia and Pennsylvania, \$3,000,000;

Hatfield Bottom (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sand River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$1,000,000;

Lower Mingo (Kermit) (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sand River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$6,300,000;

Lower Mingo, West Virginia, Tributaries Supplement, \$150,000;

Upper Mingo County (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sand River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$3,000,000;

Levisa Basin Flood Warning System (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky and Virginia, \$400,000;

Tug Fork Basin Flood Warning System (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$400,000; and

Wayne County (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$1,200,000;

Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to proceed with design and construction of the Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana, project and to award continuing contracts, which are not to be considered fully funded, beginning in fiscal year 1998 consistent with the limit of the authorized appropriation ceiling: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$225,000 of funds provided herein to construct necessary repairs to the flume and conduit for flood control at the Hagerman's Run, Williamsport, Pennsylvania, flood control project: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to incorporate the economic analyses for the Green Ridge and Plot sections of the Lackawanna River, Scranton, Pennsylvania, project with the economic analysis for the Albright Street section of the project, and to cost-share and implement these combined sections as a single project with no separable elements, except that each section may be undertaken individually when the non-Federal sponsor provides the applicable local cooperation requirements: Provided further, That section 114 of Public Law 101-101, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1990, is amended by striking "total cost of \$19,600,000" and inserting in lieu thereof, "total cost of \$40,000,000": Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to combine the Wilmington Harbor—Northeast Cape Fear River, North Carolina, project authorized in section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, the Wilmington Harbor, Channel Widening, North Carolina, project authorized in section 101(a)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, and the Cape Fear—Northeast (Cape Fear) Rivers, North Carolina, project authorized in section 101(a)(22) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 into a single project with one Project Cooperation Agreement based on cost sharing as a single project: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$20,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to initiate construction of the Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, project and execute a Project Cooperation Agreement for the entire project authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Public Law 104-303: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief

of Engineers, may use up to \$5,000,000 of the funding appropriated herein to initiate construction of an emergency outlet from Devils Lake, North Dakota, to the Sheyenne river, and that this amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(D)(i)); except that funds shall not become available unless the Secretary of the Army determines that an emergency (as defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)) exists with respect to the emergency need for the outlet and reports to Congress that the construction is technically sound, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable and in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.): Provided further, That the economic justification for the emergency outlet shall be prepared in accordance with the principles and guidelines for economic evaluation as required by regulations and procedures of the Army Corps of Engineers for all flood control projects, and that the economic justification be fully described, including the analysis of the benefits and costs, in the project plan documents: Provided further, That the plans for the emergency outlet shall be reviewed and, to be effective, shall contain assurances provided by the Secretary of State, after consultation with the International Joint Commission, that the project will not violate the requirements or intent of the Treaty Between the United States and Great Britain Relating to Boundary Waters Between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington January 11, 1909 (36 Stat. 2448; TS 548) (commonly known as the "Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909"): Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army shall submit the final plans and other documents for the emergency outlet to Congress: Provided further, That no funds made available under this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used by the Secretary of the Army to carry out the portion of the feasibility study of the Devils Lake Basin, North Dakota, authorized under the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-377), that addresses the needs of the area for stabilized lake levels through inlet controls, or to otherwise study any facility or carry out any activity that would permit the transfer of water from the Missouri River Basin into Devils Lake: Provided further, That the entire amount of \$5,000,000 shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes the designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to use \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to implement section 211(f)(6) of Public Law 104-303 (110 Stat. 3683) and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor a portion of the Federal share of project construction costs for the flood control components comprising the Brays Bayou element of the project for flood control, Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, Texas.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), \$296,212,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding the funding limitations set forth in Public Law 104-6 (109 Stat. 85), the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to use additional funds appropriated herein or previously appropriated to complete remedial measures to prevent slope in-

stability at Hickman Bluff, Kentucky: Provided further, That, using funds appropriated in this Act, the Secretary of the Army may construct the Ten and Fifteen Mile Bayou channel enlargement as an integral part of the work accomplished on the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri Project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1950: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use up to \$4,000,000, including the \$1,900,000 appropriated herein, to dredge Sardis Lake, Mississippi, at 100 percent Federal cost, so that the City of Sardis, Mississippi, may proceed with its development of the valuable resources of Sardis Lake in Mississippi, consistent with language provided in House Report 104-679, accompanying the Fiscal Year 1997 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act (Public Law 104-206): Provided further, That within available funds, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to conduct, at 100 percent Federal cost, the necessary Environmental Assessment and Impact Studies for the initial components of Sardis Lake development as provided in the Sardis Lake Recreation and Tourism Master Plan, Phase II.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation, \$1,740,025,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, may be derived from that Fund, and of which such sums as become available from the special account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601), may be derived from that Fund for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities, and of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

Anclote River, Florida, \$1,500,000;

Beverly Shores, Indiana, \$1,700,000;

Boston Harbor, Massachusetts, \$16,500,000;

Flint River, Michigan, \$875,000; and

Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania, \$4,690,000:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use funds appropriated in Public Law 104-206 to reimburse the local sponsor of the Fort Myers Beach, Florida, project for the maintenance dredging performed by the local sponsor to open the authorized channel to navigation in fiscal year 1996: Provided further, That no funds, whether appropriated, contributed, or otherwise provided, shall be available to the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the purpose of acquiring land in Jasper County, South Carolina, in connection with the Savannah Harbor navigation project: Provided, further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to dredge a navigational channel in the Chena River at Fairbanks, Alaska, from its confluence with the Tanana River upstream to the University Road Bridge that will allow the safe passage during normal water levels of vessels up to 350 feet in length, 60 feet in width, and drafting up to 3 feet: Provided further, That using \$6,000,000 of funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army is directed to extend the navigation channel on the Allegheny River, Pennsylvania, project to provide passenger boat access to the Kittanning, Pennsylvania, Riverfront Park: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is

directed to use \$2,500,000 of the funds provided herein to implement measures upstream of Lake Cumberland, Kentucky, to intercept and dispose of solid waste.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for administration of laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands, \$106,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For expenses necessary for emergency flood control, hurricane, and shore protection activities, as authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary to administer and execute the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program to clean up contaminated sites throughout the United States where work was performed as part of the Nation's early atomic energy program, \$140,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for these activities in this Act or any previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation account, and thereafter, may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers, activities of the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity, the Engineering Strategic Studies Center, the Water Resources Support Center, and the USACE Finance Center, and for costs of implementing the Secretary of the Army's plan to reduce the number of division offices as directed in title I, Public Law 104-206, \$148,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That no part of any other appropriation provided in title I, of this Act shall be available to fund the activities of the Office of the Chief of Engineers or the executive direction and management activities of the division offices.

REVOLVING FUND

Amounts in the Revolving Fund may be used to construct a 17,000 square foot addition to the United States Army Corps of Engineers Alaska District main office building on Elmendorf Air Force Base. The Revolving Fund shall be reimbursed for such funding from the benefiting appropriations by collection each year of user fees sufficient to repay the capitalized cost of the asset and to operate and maintain the asset.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Appropriations in this title shall be available for official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$5,000); and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed 100 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

SEC. 101. In fiscal year 1998, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to provide planning, design and construction assistance to non-Federal interests in carrying out water related environmental infrastructure and environmental resources development projects in Alaska, including assistance for wastewater treatment and related facilities; water supply, storage, treatment and distribution facilities; and development, restoration or improvement of wetlands and other aquatic areas for the purpose of protection and development of surface water resources: Provided, That the non-Federal interest

shall enter into a binding agreement with the Secretary wherein the non-Federal interest will provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredge material disposal areas required for the projects, and pay 50 per centum of the costs of required feasibility studies, 25 per centum of the costs of designing and constructing the project, and 100 per centum of the costs of operation, maintenance, repair, replacement or rehabilitation of the project: Provided further, That the value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations and dredged material disposal areas provided by the non-Federal interest shall be credited toward the non-Federal share, not to exceed 25 per centum, of the costs of designing and constructing the project: Provided further, That utilizing \$5,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary is directed to carry out this section.

SEC. 102. GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, NEW JERSEY.—No funds made available under this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used by the Secretary of the Army to construct the Oak Way detention structure or the Sky Top detention structure in Berkeley Heights, New Jersey, as part of the project for flood control, Green Brook Sub-basin, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662, 100 Stat. 4119).

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

For carrying out activities authorized by the Central Utah Project Completion Act, and for activities related to the Uintah and Upalco Units authorized by 43 U.S.C. 620, \$40,353,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$16,610,000 shall be deposited into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account: Provided, That of the amounts deposited into that account, \$5,000,000 shall be considered the Federal contribution authorized by paragraph 402(b)(2) of the Central Utah Project Completion Act and \$11,610,000 shall be available to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission to carry out activities authorized under that Act.

In addition, for necessary expenses incurred in carrying out related responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior, \$800,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau as follows:

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For management, development, and restoration of water and related natural resources and for related activities, including the operation, maintenance and rehabilitation of reclamation and other facilities, participation in fulfilling related Federal responsibilities to Native Americans, and related grants to, and cooperative and other agreements with, State and local governments, Indian tribes, and others, \$694,348,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$18,758,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and \$56,442,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund, and of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund: Provided, That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation under this heading: Provided further, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities that can be financed by the Reclamation Fund or the Bureau of Reclamation special fee account established by 16 U.S.C.

4601-6a(i) shall be derived from that Fund or account: Provided further, That funds contributed under 43 U.S.C. 395 are available until expended for the purposes for which contributed: Provided further, That funds advanced under 43 U.S.C. 397a shall be credited to this account and are available until expended for the same purposes as the sums appropriated under this heading: Provided further, That any amounts provided for the safety of dams modification work at Coolidge Dam, San Carlos Irrigation Project, Arizona, are in addition to the amount authorized in 43 U.S.C. 509: Provided further, That using \$500,000 of funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Interior shall undertake a non-reimbursable project to install drains in the Pena Blanca area of New Mexico to prevent seepage from Cochiti Dam: Provided further, That funds available for expenditure for the Department Irrigation Drainage Program may be expended by the Bureau of Reclamation for site remediation on a nonreimbursable basis: Provided further, That the amount authorized for Indian municipal, rural, and industrial water features by Section 10 of Public Law 89-108, as amended by Section 8 of Public Law 99-294 and Section 1701(b) of Public Law 102-575, is increased by \$1,300,000 (October, 1997 prices): Provided further, That the unexpended balances of the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation accounts for "Construction Program (Including Transfer of Funds)", "General Investigations", "Emergency Fund", and "Operation and Maintenance" shall be transferred to and merged with this account, to be available for the purposes for which they originally were appropriated: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior may use \$2,500,000 of funds appropriated herein to initiate construction of the McCall Area Wastewater Reclamation and Reuse, Idaho, project.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans and/or grants, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by the Small Reclamation Projects Act of August 6, 1956, as amended (43 U.S.C. 422a-422j): Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$31,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the program for direct loans and/or grants, \$425,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the total sums appropriated, the amount of program activities that can be financed by the Reclamation Fund shall be derived from that Fund.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

For carrying out the programs, projects, plans, and habitat restoration, improvement, and acquisition provisions of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, such sums as may be collected in the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund pursuant to sections 3407(d), 3404(c)(3), 3405(f), and 3406(c)(1) of Public Law 102-575, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to levy additional mitigation and restoration payments totaling no more than \$25,130,000 (October 1992 price levels) on a three-year rolling average basis, as authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102-575.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and other participating Federal agencies in carrying out the California Bay-Delta Environmental Enhancement and Water Security Act consistent with plans to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with such Federal agencies, \$85,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such amounts as may be necessary to

conform with such plans shall be transferred to appropriate accounts of such Federal agencies: Provided, That such funds may be obligated only as non-Federal sources provide their share in accordance with the cost-sharing agreement required under section 102(d) of such Act: Provided further, That such funds may be obligated prior to the completion of a final programmatic environmental impact statement only if: (1) consistent with 40 C.F.R. 1506.1(c); and (2) used for purposes that the Secretary finds are of sufficiently high priority to warrant such an expenditure.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of policy, administration, and related functions in the office of the Commissioner, the Denver office, and offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation, to remain available until expended, \$47,558,000, to be derived from the Reclamation Fund and be nonreimbursable as provided in 43 U.S.C. 377: Provided, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted as policy and administrative expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY PROGRAMS

ENERGY SUPPLY

For expenses of the Department of Energy activities including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for energy supply, and uranium supply and enrichment activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$906,807,000.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for non-defense environmental management activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction or expansion, \$497,059,000, to remain available until expended.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

For necessary expenses in carrying out uranium enrichment facility decontamination and decommissioning, remedial actions and other activities of title II of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and title X, subtitle A of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, \$220,200,000, to be derived from the Fund, to remain available until expended: Provided, That \$40,000,000 of amounts derived from the Fund for such expenses shall be available in accordance with title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

SCIENCE

For expenses of the Department of Energy activities including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for science activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and purchase of 15 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$2,235,708,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That \$35,000,000 of the unobligated balances originally available for Superconducting Super

Collider termination activities shall be made available for other activities under this heading.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97-425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, \$160,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund; of which \$4,000,000 shall be available to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to license a multi-purpose canister design; and of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 may be provided to affected local governments, as defined in Public Law 97-425, to conduct appropriate activities pursuant to the Act: Provided, That the distribution of the funds to the units of local government shall be determined by the Department of Energy: Provided further, That the funds shall be made available to the units of local government by direct payment: Provided further, That within ninety days of the completion of each Federal fiscal year, each local entity shall provide certification to the Department of Energy, that all funds expended from such payments have been expended for activities as defined in Public Law 97-425. Failure to provide such certification shall cause such entity to be prohibited from any further funding provided for similar activities: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be: (1) used directly or indirectly to influence legislative action on any matter pending before Congress or a State legislature or for lobbying activity as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1913; (2) used for litigation expenses; or (3) used to support multistate efforts or other coalition building activities inconsistent with the restrictions contained in this Act: Provided further, That none of the funds provided herein shall be distributed to the State of Nevada by direct payment, grant, or other means, for financial assistance under section 116 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended: Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to payments in lieu of taxes under section 116(c)(3)(A) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$35,000), \$218,747,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total \$131,330,000 in fiscal year 1998 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, and may remain available until expended, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of miscellaneous revenues received during fiscal year 1998 so as to result in a final fiscal year 1998 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than \$87,417,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$27,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act 42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; and the purchase of

passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 70 for replacement only), \$4,146,692,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funding for any ballistic missile defense program undertaken by the Department of Energy for the Department of Defense shall be provided by the Department of Defense according to procedures established for Work for Others by the Department of Energy.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

For Department of Energy Expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental restoration and waste management activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 6 for replacement only), \$4,429,438,000, to remain available until expended; and, in addition, \$200,000,000 for privatization projects, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

For expenses of the Department of Energy to accelerate the closure of defense environmental management sites, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other necessary expenses, \$890,800,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101, et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 2 for replacement only), \$1,666,008,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97-425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, \$190,000,000, to remain available until expended.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of projects in Alaska and of marketing electric power and energy, \$3,500,000, to remain available until expended; and, in addition, \$10,000,000 for capital assets acquisition, to remain available until expended.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93-454, are approved for the anadromous fish supplementation facilities in the Yakima River Basin, Methow River Basin and Upper Snake River Basin, for the Billy Shaw Reservoir resident fish substitution project, and for the resident trout fish culture facility in Southeast Idaho; and official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$3,000.

During fiscal year 1998, no new direct loan obligation may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$12,222,000, to

remain available until expended; in addition, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, not to exceed \$20,000,000 in reimbursement for transmission wheeling and ancillary services, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN
POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, and for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500 in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$25,210,000, to remain available until expended; in addition, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, not to exceed \$4,650,000 in reimbursements, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND
MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINIS-
TRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including the replacement of not more than two helicopters through transfers, exchanges, or sale, and official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, \$189,043,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$182,806,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: Provided, That of the amount herein appropriated, \$5,592,000 is for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to title IV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer from the Colorado River Dam Fund to the Western Area Power Administration \$5,592,000 to carry out the power marketing and transmission activities of the Boulder Canyon project as provided in section 104(a)(4) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984, to remain available until expended.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND
MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, \$970,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 423 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994 and 1995.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$3,000), \$162,141,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$162,141,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 1998 shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 1998 so as to result in a final fiscal year 1998 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than \$0.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to award a management and operating contract unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures or the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. The Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(b) At least 60 days before a contract award, amendment, or modification for which the Secretary intends to grant such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit to the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report notifying the subcommittees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

SEC. 302. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to award, amend, or modify a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. The Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(b) At least 60 days before a contract award, amendment, or modification for which the Secretary intends to grant such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit to the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report notifying the subcommittees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

SEC. 303. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to—

(1) develop or implement a workforce restructuring plan that covers employees of the Department of Energy; or

(2) provide enhanced severance payments or other benefits for employees of the Department of Energy;

under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 106 Stat. 2644; 42 U.S.C. 7274h).

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to augment the \$61,159,000 made available for obligation by this Act for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 106 Stat. 2644; 42 U.S.C. 7274h).

SEC. 305. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to prepare or initiate Requests For Proposals (RFPs) for a program if the program has not been funded by Congress.

(TRANSFERS OF UNEXPENDED BALANCES)

SEC. 306. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

TITLE IV
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, notwithstanding section 405 of said Act, and for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-Chairman and the alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5

U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$170,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100-456, section 1441, \$17,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; official representation expenses (not to exceed \$20,000); reimbursements to the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, \$468,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount appropriated herein, \$15,000,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: Provided further, That from this appropriation, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That moneys received by the Commission for the cooperative nuclear safety research program, services rendered to State governments, foreign governments and international organizations, and the material and information access authorization programs, including criminal history checks under section 149 of the Atomic Energy Act may be retained and used for salaries and expenses associated with those activities, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$450,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That \$3,000,000 of the funds herein appropriated for regulatory reviews and other assistance provided to the Department of Energy and other Federal agencies shall be excluded from license fee revenues, notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 2214: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 1998 from licensing fees, inspection services and other services and collections, excluding those moneys received for the cooperative nuclear safety research program, services rendered to State governments, foreign governments and international organizations, and the material and information access authorization programs, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1998 appropriation estimated at not more than \$18,000,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$4,800,000, to remain available until expended; and in addition, an amount not to exceed 5 percent of this sum may be transferred from Salaries and Expenses, Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Provided, That notice of such transfers shall be given to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate: Provided further, That from this appropriation, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is

made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 1998 from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1998 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100-203, section 5051, \$2,600,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, and to remain available until expended.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C. Ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$70,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$6,900,000 shall be available for operation, maintenance, surveillance, and improvement of Land Between the Lakes; and for essential stewardship activities for which appropriations were provided to the Tennessee Valley Authority in Public Law 104-206, such sums as are necessary in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, to be derived only from one or more of the following sources: nonpower fund balances and collections; investment returns of the nonpower program; applied programmatic savings in the power and nonpower programs; savings from the suspension of bonuses and award; savings from reductions in memberships and contributions; increases in collections resulting from nonpower activities, including user fees; or increases in charges to private and public utilities both investor and cooperatively owned, as well as to direct load customers: Provided, That such funds are available to fund the stewardship activities under this paragraph, notwithstanding sections 11, 14, 15, 29, or other provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, or provisions of the TVA power bond covenants: Provided further, That the savings from, and revenue adjustments to, the TVA budget in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter shall be sufficient to fund the aforementioned stewardship activities such that the net spending authority and resulting outlays for these activities shall not exceed \$0 in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 502. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person in-

tentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education, or subelement thereof, that is currently ineligible for contracts and grants pursuant to section 514 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-270).

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended to enter into or renew a contract with a contractor that is subject to the reporting requirement set forth in subsection (d) of section 4212 of title 38, United States Code, but has not submitted the most recent report required by such subsection.

SEC. 505. None of the funds made available in this Act to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of the Interior may be used for the Animas-La Plata Project, in Colorado and New Mexico, except for: (1) activities required to comply with the applicable provisions of current law; and (2) continuation of activities pursuant to the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-585).

SEC. 506. Section 1621 of title XVI of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Act, Public Law 104-266, is amended by—

(1) striking "study" in the section title and in subsection (a), and inserting "project" into the title and in subsection (a);

(2) inserting in subsection (a) "planning, design, and construction of the" following "to participate in the"; and

(3) inserting in subsection (a) "and nonpotable surface water" following "impaired ground water".

SEC. 507. Section 1208(a)(2) of the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Treaty Settlement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-434) is amended by striking "\$4,000,000 for construction" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$13,000,000, at 1997 prices, for construction plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations of applicable cost indexes".

SEC. 508. (a) The State of West Virginia shall receive credit towards its required contribution under Contract No. DACW59-C-0071 for the cost of recreational facilities to be constructed by a joint venture of the State in cooperation with private interests for recreation development at Stonewall Jackson Lake, West Virginia, except that the State shall receive no credit for costs associated with golf course development and the amount of the credit may not exceed the amount owed by State under the Contract.

(b) The Corps of Engineers shall revise both the 1977 recreation cost-sharing agreement and the Park and Recreation Lease dated October 2, 1995 to remove the requirement that such recreation facilities are to be owned by the Government at the time of their completion as contained in Article 2-06 of the cost-sharing agreement and Article 36 of the lease.

(c) Nothing in this section shall reduce the amount of funds owed the United States Government pursuant to the 1977 recreation cost-sharing agreement.

SEC. 509. Amounts to be transferred to the Department of Energy by the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) pursuant to this section shall be retained and used for the specific purpose of development and demonstration of AVLIS technology for uranium enrichment: Provided, That, notwithstanding section 1605 of

the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2297e-4), USEC shall transfer to the Department such sums as are necessary in fiscal year 1998 for AVLIS demonstration and development activities to be derived only from one or more of the following sources: savings from adjustments in the level of inventories; savings from reductions in capital and operating costs; savings from reductions in power costs including savings from increased use of off-peak power; or savings from adjustments in the amount of purchases: Provided further, That the savings from such reductions and adjustments in the amounts paid by USEC in fiscal year 1998 shall be sufficient to fund the aforementioned AVLIS demonstration and development activities such that the net spending authority and resulting outlays for these activities shall not exceed \$0 in fiscal year 1998 and thereafter: Provided further, That, prior to transferring funds to the Department for AVLIS activities pursuant to this section, the Chief Financial Officer of USEC shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate an itemized listing of the amounts of the reductions made pursuant to this section to fund the proposed transfer: Provided further, That, by November 1, 1998, the Chief Financial Officer of USEC shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate an itemized listing of the amounts of the reductions made pursuant to this section for fiscal year 1998: Provided further, That the provisions in this section related to the transfer to and use by the Department of funds for AVLIS demonstration and development activities shall expire as of the privatization date for USEC, as defined in Section 3102 of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h), and the total amount obligated by the Department pursuant to this section for AVLIS demonstration and development activities shall not exceed \$60,000,000.

SEC. 510. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform to the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters.

(b) The costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the costs of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be classified by the Secretary of the Interior as reimbursable or nonreimbursable and collected until fully repaid pursuant to the "Cleanup Program—Alternative Repayment Plan" and the "SJVD—Alternative Repayment Plan" described in the report entitled "Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995", prepared by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. Any future obligations of funds by the United States relating to, or providing for, drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries of such service or studies pursuant to Federal Reclamation law.

SEC. 511. MAINTENANCE OF SECURITY AT THE GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANTS.—Section 3107 of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h-5) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) MAINTENANCE OF SECURITY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Kentucky, and the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Ohio, the guidelines relating to the authority of the Department of Energy's contractors (including any Federal agency, or private entity operating a gaseous diffusion plant under a contract or lease with the Department of Energy) and any subcontractor (at any tier) to carry firearms and

make arrests in providing security at Federal installations, issued under section 161k. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2201k.) shall require, at a minimum, the presence of an adequate number of security guards carrying sidearms at all times to ensure maintenance of security at the gaseous diffusion plants (whether a gaseous diffusion plant is operated directly by a Federal agency or by a private entity under a contract or lease with a Federal agency).

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to restart the High Flux Beam Reactor.

This Act may be cited as the "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998".

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOSEPH MCDADE,
HAROLD ROGERS,
JOE KNOLLENBERG,
R.P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
MIKE PARKER,
SONNY CALLAHAN,
JAY DICKEY,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
VIC FAZIO,
PETER J. VISCLOSKEY,
CHET EDWARDS,
ED PASTOR,
DAVID R. OBEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
THAD COCHRAN,
SLADE GORTON,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
CONRAD BURNS,
LARRY CRAIG,
TED STEVENS,
HARRY REID,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
PATTY MURRAY,
HERB KOHL,
BYRON L. DORGAN,
DANIEL K. INOUE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the Senate of the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The language and allocations set forth in House Report 105-190 and Senate Report 105-44 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of the managers. Report language included by the House which is not contradicted by the report of the Senate or the conference, and Senate report language which is not contradicted by the report of the House or the conference is approved by the committee on conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases where both the House report and Senate report address a particular issue not specifically addressed in the conference report or joint statement of managers, the conferees have determined that the House and Senate reports are not inconsistent and are to be interpreted accordingly. In cases in which the House or Senate have directed the submission of a report, such report is to be submitted to both House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Senate amendment: The Senate deleted the entire House bill after the enacting clause and inserted the Senate bill. The conference agreement includes a revised bill.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs, and activities of the Corps of Engineers. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

The conference agreement appropriates \$156,804,000 for General Investigations instead of \$157,260,000 as proposed by the House and \$164,065,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of the need for navigational improvements on the Mobile, Tombigbee, and Black Warrior Rivers in accordance with the resolution (Docket #2512) adopted on May 7, 1997, by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

The conferees have provided an additional \$200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to accelerate work on the feasibility study for the development of a comprehensive basin management plan for navigation, including recreational navigation, environmental restoration, and water quality for the Dog River, Alabama, watershed.

The conference agreement includes \$270,000 for the Newport Bay Harbor, California, study, the same as the budget request. Within the funds provided, \$100,000 is for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study for management of the Newport Bay/San Diego Creek Watershed in the interest of environmental preservation and restoration, water quality and sediment control, and the avoidance or minimization of undesirable impacts resulting from urbanization and other present and future watershed activities.

The conferees have provided \$40,000 for completion of the feasibility study for navigational improvements at Port Hueneme in California, the same as the budget request. Federal interest recommendations for channel improvements shall be based on the potential for future shipping operations at the port.

The conference agreement includes \$100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of options for increased flood protection along the Toulumne River and its tributaries.

The conferees direct the Secretary of the Army to use the \$600,000 provided for the Truckee Meadows, Reno, Nevada, project authorized by Section 3(a)(10) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 to resume preconstruction engineering and design incorporating recent data from the 1996/1997 flooding event.

The conference agreement includes \$200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to participate in the development of Special Area Management Plans in Orange and San Diego Counties, California, as described in the House report.

The conference agreement includes \$500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to modify the Lower West Branch Susquehanna River Basin Environmental Restoration, Pennsylvania, reconnaissance study to address the wide range of complex water resources problems in the large study area which includes Clinton, Northumberland, Lycoming, Sullivan, Tioga, and Union Counties, Pennsylvania and, as requested, to negotiate sep-

arate feasibility study agreements with state, county, and other public interests for subwatersheds within the river basin.

The conference agreement includes \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate for a study of the Grand Neosho River basin in Oklahoma as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to move the funds for this effort to the Operation and Maintenance, General account.

The conferees agree that funds provided for the Lower Platte River and Tributaries, Nebraska, study should also be used to conduct studies authorized by Section 503(d)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

For the Lower Potomac Estuary Watershed, Virginia and Maryland, study, the conferees expect the Corps of Engineers to negotiate separate feasibility study cost-sharing agreements with state and local interests in Virginia and Maryland for individual sub-basins within the watershed.

The conference agreement includes \$8,500,000 for Coordination Studies With Other Agencies. Within the funds provided, the conferees urge the Corps of Engineers to work with the Riverside County, California, Flood Control and Water Conservation District to complete the floodplain maintenance plan for Murrieta Creek and to participate in the development of Special Area Management Plans in southern California in coordination with the State of California Natural Community Conservation Planning Program. In addition, the amount provided includes \$400,000 for the Pacific Northwest forest case study as described in the Senate report.

The conference agreement includes \$32,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers Research and Development program instead of \$27,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$37,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes \$2,000,000 for the development of strategies for the control of zebra mussels and the full budget request for the CFIRMS program.

The conferees have included language in the bill earmarking funds for the following projects in the amounts specified: Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey, \$456,000; Tampa Harbor, Alafia Channel, Florida, \$270,000; Laulaulei, Hawaii, \$200,000; Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey, \$400,000; Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey, \$472,000; Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey, \$400,000; Lower Cape May Meadows—Cape May Point, New Jersey, \$154,000; Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, \$400,000; Raritan Bay to Sandy Hook Bay (Cliffwood Beach), New Jersey, \$300,000; Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey, \$500,000; and Monongahela River, Fairmont, West Virginia, \$350,000.

The conference agreement deletes funds earmarked in the Senate bill for the Norco Bluffs, California, project. This project has been funded in the Construction, General, account.

The conference agreement deletes language contained in the Senate bill providing funds for the Tahoe Basin study in California and Nevada. The amount appropriated for General Investigations includes \$750,000 for this project. The conference agreement also deletes language contained in the Senate bill providing funds for preconstruction engineering and design for the Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Delaware, project. The amount appropriated for General Investigations includes \$300,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the project.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which directs the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility

phase studies of extending commercial navigation on the Red River upstream of Shreveport-Bossier, Louisiana, into southwest Arkansas using previously appropriated funds and language proposed by the House which directs the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies for the Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, Kentucky, study.

The conferees have also included language in the bill directing the Corps of Engineers to use \$150,000 to implement Section 211(f)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor a portion of the Federal share of project costs for the White Oak Bayou, Texas, project, and language directing the Corps of Engineers to use \$500,000 to implement Section 211(f)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor a portion of the Federal share of project costs for the Hunting Bayou, Texas, project.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

The conference agreement appropriates \$1,473,373,000 for Construction, General, instead of \$1,475,892,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,284,266,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree with the language in the Senate report regarding the Faulkner's Island, Connecticut, project.

The Secretary of the Army is directed to use \$600,000 of available funds to plan and implement a flood warning system for Reno, Nevada, using, to the maximum extent possible, work of non-Federal entities.

The conference agreement includes \$1,140,000 for the Canaveral Harbor Deepening, Florida, project. The funds provided include \$640,000 to reimburse the local sponsor for the Federal share of revetment work completed by the sponsor and \$500,000 for widening of the entrance channel.

With the funds provided for the East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, project the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reevaluation report to identify more cost-effective measures of providing storm damage protection for the project. In conducting the reevaluation, the Corps should include consideration of using dredged material from maintenance dredging of East Rockaway Inlet and should also investigate the potential for ecosystem restoration within the project area.

Within the funds provided for the Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, the conferees expect the Corps of Engineers to give priority to projects that protect the environmental, historic, and cultural resources of Smith Island, Maryland and Virginia.

The conference agreement provides funding for small boat harbor projects at Knife River, McQuade Road (Duluth), Taconite Harbor, and Two Harbors, Minnesota. Each of these projects is fully authorized. By providing funding for these projects, the conferees intend that these badly needed projects proceed expeditiously, and direct the Secretary of the Army to expedite the consideration and construction of these projects. In addition, the Secretary is to preserve scarce Federal, state, and local resources by utilizing a flexible approach in pursuing these projects. The managers are aware that, in the construction of another small boat harbor at Silver Bay, a cooperative effort with state and local interests allowed for the swift and satisfactory completion of the project. The managers direct the Secretary to employ similar procedures, including using existing feasibility and other study documents and designs prepared by the State of Minnesota, and to construct the project in cooperation with the state.

The conference agreement includes \$3,100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete planning engineering and design and initiate construction of the Lower Basin and Stony Brook portions of the Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, New Jersey, project. Within the funds provided, \$100,000 shall be used to reevaluate alternative plans for the Upper Basin portion of the project. Language has been included under General Provisions, Corps of Engineers—Civil, which provides that no funds made available in this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be utilized by the Secretary of the Army to construct the Oak Way detention structure or the Sky Top detention structure in Berkeley Heights, New Jersey, as part of the project for flood control.

The conference agreement includes \$95,000,000 for the Columbia River Juvenile Fish Mitigation program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho instead of \$85,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$117,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees note that the budget request for this program appeared to reflect the pursuit of multiple restoration strategies. Some of these may not be adopted, rendering expensive measures obsolete. The conferees request the Northwest Power Planning Council, with assistance from the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (to the extent that the Board feels it can participate without compromising its primary function), established jointly with the National Marine Fisheries Service, to conduct a review of the major fish mitigation capital construction activities proposed for implementation at the Federal dams in the Columbia River Basin including those called for in the 1995 Biological Opinion of the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding the Snake River salmon. The review shall be completed by June 30, 1998. Upon completion of the review, the Corps of Engineers shall seek regional recommendations, as provided by the Bonneville Power Administration Fish and Wildlife Budget Memorandum of Agreement dated September 16, 1996, on implementing the recommendations contained in the review. In addition, the findings of the review shall be supplied to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The conference agreement includes a total of \$58,267,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project. In addition to the amounts in the budget request, the conference agreement includes: \$26,390,000 for the Harlan, Williamsburg, and Middlesboro, Kentucky, elements; \$5,300,000 for the Pike County, Kentucky, element; \$5,000,000 for the Martin County, Kentucky, element; \$700,000 for the Town of Martin, Kentucky, element; \$500,000 for a Detailed Project Report for the Buchanan County, Virginia, element; \$1,000,000 for the Hatfield Bottom, West Virginia, element; \$6,300,000 for the Lower Mingo (Kermit), West Virginia, element; \$150,000 for a Detailed Project Report for the Lower Mingo, West Virginia, element; \$3,000,000 for the Upper Mingo, West Virginia, element; \$1,200,000 for the Wayne County, West Virginia, element; \$400,000 for a flood warning system for the Levisa Basin; and \$400,000 for a flood warning system for the Tug Fork Basin. In addition, the conferees are aware of the flood situation at Haysi Dam and urge the Corps of Engineers to reevaluate the benefit-cost analysis and provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate a report on the Haysi Dam, Virginia, element of the project prior to submission of the fiscal year 1999 budget. The conference agreement also deletes language proposed by the Senate which provided that flood warning systems for the Tug Fork and Levisa Basins would be undertaken at full Federal expense.

Using \$463,000 of the funds provided for the LaFarge Lake and Kickapoo River, Wisconsin, project, the Corps of Engineers is directed to complete the Memorandum of Understanding between the Ho-Chunk Nation and the State of Wisconsin, evaluate a conservation easement, covenant, or other appropriate legal instrument for the protection of archeological resources at the site, start processing real estate documents for future land transfers, and continue coordination activities as authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. The remaining \$250,000 is for planning and engineering of the highway relocations and to complete required NEPA documentation as authorized.

The conference agreement includes \$40,000,000 for the Section 205 program. Using those funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the projects described in the House and Senate reports. For the Lake Carl Blackwell project in Oklahoma, the Corps of Engineers may use available funds to proceed with plans and specifications for the project. In addition, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with studies of flooding problems along Dry Creek in Cortland County, New York, and the Lamoille and Missisquoi Rivers in Vermont.

The conferees agree that the Huntsville Spring Branch, Alabama, project funded by the House under Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 should proceed as a small flood control project under the Section 205 program. The conferees also agree that the Reno, Nevada, project and the Lycoming County, Pennsylvania, project should proceed under the Section 205 program.

The conference agreement includes \$11,000,000 for the Section 14 program. Using those funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the projects described in the House and Senate reports.

The conference agreement includes \$3,000,000 for the Section 103 program. Using those funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the projects described in the House report.

The conference agreement includes \$11,400,000 for the Section 107 program. Using those funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the projects described in the House and Senate reports.

The conference agreement includes \$2,000,000 for the Section 208 program. Using those funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the projects described in the House report.

The aquatic restoration project at Hamilton Army Airfield in Marin County, California, funded under the Section 204 program by the House has been funded under the General Investigations account.

The conference agreement includes \$21,175,000 for the Section 1135 program. Using those funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the projects described in the House and Senate reports.

The conference agreement includes \$6,000,000 for the Section 206 program. Using those funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the projects described in the House and the Senate reports. In addition, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with a project to restore environmental resources along Cache Creek in California. Abandoned gravel pits along the lower Cache Creek corridor would be used to restore seasonal and permanent wetlands and riparian habitat.

The conferees have included language in the bill earmarking funds for the following projects in the amounts specified: Arkansas River, Tucker Creek, Arkansas, \$300,000; Norco Bluffs, California, \$1,000,000; San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem),

California, \$5,000,000; Panama City Beaches, Florida, \$5,000,000; Tybee Island, Georgia, \$2,000,000; Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana \$5,000,000; Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana, \$3,000,000; Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, \$3,500,000; Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana \$1,300,000; Harlan, Williamsburg, and Middlesboro (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, \$26,390,000; Martin County (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, \$5,000,000; Pike County (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, \$5,300,000; Town of Martin (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, \$700,000; Levisa Basin Flood Warning System (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky and Virginia, \$400,000; Salyersville, Kentucky, \$2,050,000; Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky, \$3,000,000; Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana, \$22,920,000; Lake Pontchartrain Stormwater Discharge, Louisiana, \$3,000,000; Jackson County, Mississippi, \$3,000,000; Natchez Bluff, Mississippi, \$4,000,000; Pearl River (Walkiah Bluff), Mississippi, \$2,000,000; Joseph G. Minish Passaic River Park, New Jersey, \$3,000,000; Hudson River, Athens, New York, \$8,700,000; Lackawanna River, Olyphant, Pennsylvania, \$1,400,000; Lackawanna River, Scranton, Pennsylvania, \$5,425,000; Lycoming County, Pennsylvania, \$339,000; South Central Pennsylvania Environment Improvement Program, Pennsylvania, \$30,000,000; Wallisville Lake, Texas, \$9,200,000; Virginia Beach, Virginia (Reimbursement), \$925,000; Virginia Beach (Hurricane Protection), Virginia, \$13,000,000; West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, West Virginia and Pennsylvania \$3,000,000; Hatfield Bottom (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$1,000,000; Lower Mingo (Kermit) (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$6,300,000; Lower Mingo Tributaries Supplement (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$150,000; Upper Mingo County (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$3,000,000; Tug Fork Basin Flood Warning System (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$400,000; and Wayne County (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, \$1,200,000.

For the South Central Pennsylvania Infrastructure Program, within the \$10,000,000 provided for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Lackawanna, Lycoming, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Pike, and Monroe Counties in Pennsylvania, \$1,000,000 is for Olyphant Borough, Lackawanna County; \$1,000,000 is for Jefferson Township, Lackawanna County; \$2,000,000 is for Scott Township Water and Sewer Authority, Lackawanna County; \$2,850,000 is for Westfall Municipal Sewage Authority, Pike County; \$800,000 is for the Township of Tobyhanna Sewer Authority, Monroe County; \$750,000 is for Thompson Borough, Susquehanna County; \$900,000 is for Old Lycoming Township Sewer Authority, Lycoming County; and \$700,000 is for Lycoming County Water and Sewer Authority for a public sewer extension in Armstrong Township, Lycoming County.

The conference agreement includes language in the bill directing the Secretary of the Army to: use \$225,000 to undertake repairs to the flume and conduit at

Hagerman's Run for the flood control project at Williamsport, Pennsylvania; proceed with design and construction of the Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana, project using continuing contracts consistent with the limit of the authorized appropriation ceiling; incorporate the economic analyses for the Green Ridge and Plot Sections of the Lackawanna River, Scranton, Pennsylvania, project with the analysis for the Albright Street section of the project and cost-share and implement the combined sections as single project; combine three separate navigation improvements projects in Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina, into a single project; to use \$20,000,000 to initiate construction of the Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, project and execute a Project Cooperation Agreement for the entire authorized project.

The conferees are aware that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has determined, pursuant to the requirements of Section 533(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, that additional work to be carried out on the Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana, project with funds in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated in Section 533(c) of said Act is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economic. Therefore, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to proceed immediately with design and construction of the entire Southeast Louisiana project.

The conference agreement also includes language that increases the appropriation ceiling for the Rillito River, Arizona, project and language that provides \$5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate construction of an emergency outlet from Devils Lake, North Dakota, to the Sheyenne River subject to a number of conditions. The Senate language has been amended to make technical corrections regarding the designation of the project as an emergency.

The conference agreement deletes funds earmarked in the House bill for the Flint River, Michigan, project. The project has been funded in the Operation and Maintenance, General account.

The conference agreement deletes language contained in the Senate bill earmarking funds for the Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas, project.

The conferees direct the Secretary of the Army to consider the recommendation of the Special Reevaluation Report for the McCook Reservoir, Illinois, project as developed by the Corps of Engineers Chicago District. The conference agreement deletes language contained in the Senate bill regarding this issue.

The conference agreement also includes bill language directing the Secretary of the Army to use \$2,000,000 to implement Section 211(f)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for a portion of the Federal share of the project costs for the Brays Bayou, Texas, project.

In light of the current budgetary situation, the conferees are concerned with the funding implications associated with any projects which the Secretary of the Army approves for construction by non-Federal sponsors under reimbursement authorities, such as Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. The conferees are particularly concerned with the ability to provide funding for reimbursement agreements while trying to meet the funding demands for ongoing Federal construction projects nationwide. Therefore, the conferees direct the Secretary of the Army to notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate prior to initiating negotiations for a reimbursement agreement for construction of any project. Such notification shall include the total commitment and the annual re-

quirements that the Administration proposes to support in future budget submissions. The conferees urge the Secretary to reimburse a non-Federal sponsor for applicable costs only after the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor have entered into a formal written agreement specifying the terms and conditions for the reimbursement. Given the need to establish a disciplined and orderly schedule for reimbursements, the conferees expect that the terms of the agreement will specify that reimbursements for the Federal share of project costs will be provided on an incremental basis in accordance with the terms of the agreement and on a schedule that would be consistent with a Federal construction schedule. In addition, in recognition of the need to protect the Federal interest, the conferees suggest that the Secretary include a provision in the agreement that will allow the Secretary to withhold scheduled reimbursement to the non-Federal sponsor or require the non-Federal sponsor to remit previously received reimbursements in the event that the sponsor fails to complete the entire project or a separable element of the project.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

The conference agreement appropriates \$296,212,000 for Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries instead of \$285,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$289,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$31,000,000 for the Mississippi River Levees element of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project. The increase over the budget request shall be used to bring mainline levees up to grade as described in the House report and to advance construction of the Commerce to Birds Point levee in Missouri.

The conference agreement includes \$900,000 with which the Corps of Engineers is directed to complete preconstruction engineering and design and initiate construction for the Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee project.

The conferees expect the Corps of Engineers to expedite work on East Goose Creek in Oxford, Mississippi, under the Yazoo Basin Demonstration Erosion Control Program.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate authorizing and directing the Corps of Engineers to use funds appropriated in this Act or previously appropriated funds to complete remedial measures to prevent slope instability at Hickman Bluff, Kentucky.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Secretary of the Army to use up to \$4,000,000, including \$1,900,000 appropriated in this Act, to dredge Sardis Lake, Mississippi, at full Federal expense, and which directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct, at full Federal expense, the necessary environmental assessment and impact studies for the initial components of Sardis Lake development.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

The conference agreement appropriates \$1,740,025,000 for Operation and Maintenance, General, instead of \$1,726,955,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,661,203,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have provided an additional \$150,000 under the McNary Lock and Dam project in Oregon and Washington for the Corps of Engineers to address questions and concerns raised in litigation associated with the Kennewick Man skeleton, ancient remains found at Columbia Park on the Columbia River near Kennewick, Washington. The additional funds will allow the Corps to continue to store the remains in a manner that preserves their scientific, historic, and

cultural value, address questions regarding testing of material, conduct site evaluations, and acquire expert services.

The conferees agree with the language in the Senate report regarding the Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, project.

The conference agreement includes \$400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Rincon Canal System, Texas, project as authorized by Section 509 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

For the Green Bay Harbor, Wisconsin, diked disposal project, the conferees expect the Corps of Engineers to use the funds provided to expand the existing Section 123 facility at Bay Port using the local and state approved designs. Further, the conferees intend the Bay Port expansion to be funded using the funding arrangements specified in Section 201 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

The attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance of review: Alabama-Coosa River navigation system; Brunswick Harbor, Georgia; and Little and Murrells Inlets in South Carolina.

The conference agreement includes language in the bill earmarking funds for the following projects in the amounts specified: Anclote River, Florida, \$1,500,000; Beverly Shores, Indiana, \$1,700,000; Boston Harbor, Massachusetts, \$16,500,000; Flint River, Michigan, \$875,000; and Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania, \$4,690,000.

The conference agreement includes an additional \$2,170,000 for the Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania, project for the Corps of Engineers to implement recommendations of the 1992 update of the project Master Plan and for continued operation and maintenance of project facilities.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Housing directing the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the local sponsor for the Fort Myers Beach, Florida, project for maintenance dredging performed by the local sponsor using previously appropriated funds.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that none of the funds appropriated in the Act shall be used for the purpose of acquiring land in Jasper County, South Carolina, in connection with the Savannah Harbor navigation project and language proposed by the Senate authorizing and directing the Corps of Engineers to dredge a navigation channel in the Chena River at Fairbanks, Alaska.

Language has been included in the bill which directs the Secretary of the Army to use \$6,000,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act to extend the navigation channel on the Allegheny River project to provide passenger boat access to the Kittanning, Pennsylvania, Riverfront Park.

The conference agreement includes language in the bill directing the Corps of Engineers to use \$2,500,000 to implement measures upstream of Lake Cumberland in Kentucky to intercept and dispose of solid waste. The conferees expect the Corps of Engineers to proceed with this measure in a manner that is economically feasible and in accordance with applicable law.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

The conference agreement appropriates \$106,000,000 for the Regulatory Program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$112,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees expect that the increase provided over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997 will be used to begin implementation of an administrative appeals process for the Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the

Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is urged to make a final decision with respect to the permits applied for under permit application number 95-2-00970 for the replacement of the existing 350-foot wood dock with a 400-foot concrete extension of the existing Terminal 5 dock (including associated dredging and filling) in the West Waterway of the Duwamish River in Seattle, Washington. The Secretary shall not reject that application on the basis of any claim of Indian treaty rights, but shall leave any question with respect to such rights to be determined in the course of judicial review of his action on the same basis as any other permit under Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344).

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

The conference agreement appropriates \$4,000,000 for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have agreed to include the language proposed by the Senate directing that construction of the Ten and Fifteen Mile Bayou channel enlargement project be considered as an integral part of the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, project under the Mississippi River and Tributaries account.

The conferees are concerned that funding provided by PL 105-18, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1997, is not being vigorously applied to necessary repairs and projects resulting from the disaster events of 1996 and 1997 because of an overly restrictive interpretation of PL 84-99 by the Corps of Engineers.

For example, the Corps of Engineers has determined that many of the levees in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, California, which were affected by this year's catastrophic flood, are ineligible for repair and rehabilitation with Flood Control and Coastal Emergency funds due to conditions which are considered to have existed before the flood. In addition, some projects have been rejected by not considering the economic benefits to the system as a whole.

Problems across the country are similar, where the Corps has ruled projects ineligible that may be within the scope of the statute and are likely to prevent even greater expenditures should there be future disasters. The problem is particularly acute because of the unknown effects of the impending El Nino weather system and the imminent threat that it poses to many areas of the country.

The conferees are committed to ensuring that the people and their homes, schools, and economic livelihoods, as well as critical infrastructure, are protected against future floods and direct the Corps of Engineers to perform an immediate reassessment of all projects considered for funding under PL 105-18 where PL 84-99 funding has been denied. Every effort should be made to make use of the previously-appropriated emergency funds for any and all authorized purposes within the entire reading of the statute.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

The conference agreement appropriates \$140,000,000 for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) instead of \$110,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$162,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement also transfers the FUSRAP program from the Department of Energy to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for program execution. The Corps currently manages and executes a similar program, the Formerly Used Defense Sites program, for the Department of Defense, and the conferees believe there are significant cost and

schedule efficiencies to be gained by having the Corps manage FUSRAP as well.

The conferees are aware of the concerns expressed that a transition from one Federal agency to another may create unnecessary delays in the program. The conferees expect the Department of Energy and the Corps to make every effort to ensure that this transition goes smoothly, that execution of the program is maintained in accordance with current schedules, and that overall execution performance is improved. The Department of Energy recently announced that it will complete the existing management and operating contract for the FUSRAP program with a contract change becoming effective in the spring of 1998. The conferees expect the program to continue within the existing contract framework during that period, and will expect minimal disruption in operations during that time as the terms of current contracts are honored.

The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to review the baseline cost, scope, schedule, and technical assumptions for each of the cleanup sites, and determine what actions can be taken to reduce costs and accelerate cleanup activities. The Corps should determine if it is possible and/or reasonable to meet the proposed 2002 completion date and report to the Committees on Appropriations within 90 days on what steps must be taken to meet this date.

The conferees expect the Chief of Engineers to select an organization and process within the Corps which can execute this high priority program most effectively and efficiently. To avoid potential jurisdictional problems, however, overall program management, schedule and resource priority setting, and principal point of contact responsibilities for FUSRAP are to be handled as part of, and integrally with, the overall Civil Works program of the Corps.

GENERAL EXPENSES

The conference agreement appropriates \$148,000,000 for General Expenses as proposed by the House and the Senate.

REVOLVING FUND

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which permits the Corps of Engineers to use amounts in the Revolving Fund for an addition to the Alaska District's main office building on Elmendorf Air Force Base and which directs that the Revolving Fund shall be reimbursed from the benefiting appropriations by collections each year of user fees sufficient to repay the capital cost of the asset and to operate and maintain the asset.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate which provides that the Secretary of the Army, in fiscal year 1998, shall advertise for competitive bid at least 8,500,000 cubic yards of the hopper dredge volume accomplished with Government-owned dredges in fiscal year 1992 and which, notwithstanding the provisions of this section, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to use the Corps of Engineers dredge fleet to undertake projects under certain conditions.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army to provide planning, design, and construction assistance to non-Federal interests in carrying out water related environmental infrastructure and environmental resources development projects. The Senate language has been amended to provide that the authority will be limited to fiscal year 1998 and to projects in the State of Alaska. The conference agreement provides \$5,000,000 for the

Corps of Engineers to carry out the provisions of this section.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate regarding the Raritan River Basin, Greenbrook Sub-basin flood control project in New Jersey. The Senate language has been amended to provide that none of the funds made available under

this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to construct the Oak Way detention structure or the Sky Top detention structure in Berkeley Heights, New Jersey, rather than carry out any plan for, or otherwise construct, the Oak Way detention structure or the Sky Top detention structure in Berkeley Heights, New Jersey.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to consider any application for a permit that, if granted, would result in the diversion of groundwater from the Great Lakes basin.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS — GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
ALABAMA					
(SPE)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL.....	200,000	---	400,000	---
(SPE)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	400,000	---	400,000	---
ALASKA					
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK.....	54,000	---	54,000	---
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK.....	125,000	---	125,000	---
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK.....	168,000	---	168,000	---
(N)	COASTAL STUDIES NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT, AK.....	450,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	COOK INLET, AK.....	---	125,000	---	125,000
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR, AK.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	DUTCH HARBOR, AK.....	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	KENAI RIVER, AK.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	KENAI RIVER NAVIGATION, AK.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	KUSKOKWIM RIVER, AK.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MATANUSKA RIVER, AK.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK.....	450,000	---	490,000	---
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK.....	---	37,000	---	37,000
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK.....	118,000	---	118,000	---
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK.....	150,000	---	225,000	---
(FDP)	SHIP CREEK, AK.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	SITKA LIGHTERING FACILITY, AK.....	120,000	---	120,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK.....	---	138,000	---	---
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK.....	200,000	---	330,000	---
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR, AK.....	---	---	100,000	---
ARIZONA					
(SPE)	COLONIAS ALONG U.S. - MEXICO BORDER, AZ & TX.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTH SCOTTSDALE, AZ.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN, AZ.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(E)	RIO SALADO WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM, AZ.....	540,000	---	540,000	---
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ.....	400,000	---	800,000	---
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ.....	---	825,000	---	825,000
ARKANSAS					
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR.....	240,000	---	240,000	---
(FC)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR & TX.....	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER TO NEWPORT, AR.....	---	---	---	400,000
CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA.....	---	401,000	---	1,500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING		
(FDP)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA.....	146,000	---	146,000	---
(FC)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA.....	240,000	---	750,000	---
	BOLSA CHICA CHANNEL, CA.....	---	---	40,000	---
	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLAND RESTORATION, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
	CITIES OF ARCADIA AND SIERRA MADRE, CA.....	---	---	525,000	---
	CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
	CLEAR LAKE BASIN WATERSHED RESTORATION, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
	COSUMNES AND MOKELUMNE RIVERS, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED STUDY, CA.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA.....	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(HANSEN & LOPEZ DAMS), CA.....	204,000	---	204,000	---
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(WHITTIER NARROWS & SANTA FE DAM	189,000	---	189,000	---
	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA.....	530,000	---	530,000	---
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
	MUGU LAGOON, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, C	250,000	---	250,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, COLUSA BASIN, CA.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, FAIRFIELD STREAMS AND CORDELIA MARSH, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PL	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, VACAVILLE, DIXON AND VICINITY, CA.....	200,000	50,000	200,000	50,000
(FC)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	---	---	---	---
(FDP)	NAPA RIVER, CA.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA.....	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA.....	270,000	---	270,000	---
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA.....	225,000	500,000	225,000	500,000
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA.....	---	250,000	---	250,000
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA.....	40,000	160,000	40,000	---
(N)	PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA.....	---	---	---	---
(E)	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	PRADO BASIN WATER SUPPLY, CA.....	378,000	---	378,000	---
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA.....	79,000	---	79,000	---
(E)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER, ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA.....	240,000	---	240,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA.....	750,000	---	750,000	---
(E)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WESTERN DELTA ISLANDS,	300,000	---	300,000	---
(spc)	SACRAMENTO & SAN JOAQUIN RIVERS COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, C	---	---	3,650,000	---
	SACRAMENTO WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA.....	---	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA.....	178,000	---	178,000	---
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR (DEEPENING), CA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY MARINE TERMINAL, CA....	---	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(E)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FARMINGTON DAM, CA.....	---	---	225,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&W HABITAT RESTO	400,000	---	400,000	500,000
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREA	180,000	500,000	180,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	450,000	---	225,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA...	150,000	---	150,000	---
(E)	SAN JUAN AND ALISO CREEKS WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA...	315,000	---	315,000	---
(FDP)	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA.	380,000	---	380,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA MARGARITA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	SANTA MONICA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE RELIABILITY, CA.....	---	---	500,000	---
(E)	SOUTHAMPTON SHOAL CHANNEL AND EXTENSION, CA.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(E)	SOUTHEAST LOS ANGELES CNTY WATER CONSERVATION & SUPPLY	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AQUATIC RESOURCES, CA.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV.....	320,000	---	750,000	750,000
(FDP)	TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	TOULUMNE RIVER, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	TWENTYNINE PALMS, CA.....	---	750,000	---	---
(N)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	475,000	---	475,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA.....	370,000	---	370,000	---
(FDP)	WHITewater RIVER BASIN, CA.....	---	---	200,000	---
	VENTURA - SANTA BARBARA COUNTIES SHORE PROTECTION, CA.	---	---	---	---
	COLORADO				
	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	---	---	100,000	---
	CONNECTICUT				
(E)	COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	DELAWARE				
(N)	C&D CANAL - BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEP	---	1,625,000	---	1,625,000
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ.....	150,000	---	150,000	306,000
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	293,000	---	293,000	300,000
	FLORIDA				
(N)	BIG BEND CHANNEL, FL.....	---	80,000	---	80,000
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	---	154,000
(N)	CEDAR HAMMOCK (WARES CREEK), FL.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	CHICOPIT BAY, FL.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	DADE COUNTY WATER REUSE, FL.....	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL.....	---	230,000	---	230,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.....	---	90,000	---	90,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	301,000	---	301,000	---
	LAKE WORTH INLET, FL.....	---	---	---	100,000
(BE)	LIDO KEY BEACH, FL.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL.....	---	140,000	---	290,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	---	175,000	---	175,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL.....	---	280,000	---	280,000
	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER, FL.....	---	---	270,000	---
GEORGIA					
	AUGUSTA, GA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	93,000	---	93,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(FDP)	FLINT RIVER BASIN STUDY, GA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER, GA & SC.....	---	94,000	---	94,000
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA.....	800,000	---	---	800,000
(FDP)	SAVANNAH/CHATHAM COUNTY REGIONAL FLOOD CONTROL, GA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SPEC)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC.....	---	---	300,000	---
HAWAII					
	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI.....	333,000	---	333,000	---
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI.....	---	267,000	---	267,000
(FDP)	LAULAU, HI.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI.....	227,000	---	227,000	---
ILLINOIS					
	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL.....	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	ILLINOIS RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, IL.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL & IN.....	250,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT QUINCY, IL.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL.....	---	395,000	---	395,000
	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL.....	---	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM FLD PROFILE STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	1,957,000	---	1,957,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	7,700,000	---	7,700,000	---
	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER D&LD, MADISON COUNTY, IL.....	---	112,000	---	112,000
	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL.....	---	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS — GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
INDIANA					
(FC)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN.....	---	458,000	---	458,000
(FDP)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, CADDY MARSH DITCH, IN.....	---	---	---	150,000
	WABASH RIVER BASIN (MIDDLE REACHES), IN & IL.....	56,000	---	56,000	---
IOWA					
(RCP)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA.....	339,000	---	339,000	---
(FDP)	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA.....	---	---	100,000	---
KANSAS					
(RCP)	SALINA, KS.....	135,000	---	135,000	---
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS.....	155,000	---	155,000	---
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO.....	---	261,000	---	261,000
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO.....	30,000	---	30,000	---
(RCP)	WILSON LAKE, KS.....	38,000	---	38,000	---
KENTUCKY					
	AUGUSTA, KY.....	---	---	100,000	---
	DOVER, KY.....	---	---	100,000	---
	FRANKFORT, KY.....	---	---	100,000	---
	GRAYSON LAKE, KY.....	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS NAVIGATION DISPOSITION STUDY, ..	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK, KY.....	---	1,750,000	---	---
(FDP)	LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY.....	375,000	---	375,000	---
(FC)	LICKING RIVER WATERSHED, KY.....	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY.....	---	525,000	---	525,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY.....	470,000	---	470,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY.....	8,800,000	---	8,800,000	---
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	---	---	100,000	---
	OLIVE HILL, KY.....	---	---	---	---
LOUISIANA					
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER - DARLINGTON RESERVOIR, LA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	BAYOU TIGRE, ERATH, LA.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	BLACK BAYOU DIVERSION, LA.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA.....	---	265,000	---	265,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA.....	---	620,000	---	620,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA.....	850,000	---	850,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA.....	138,000	---	138,000	---
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, LA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	PORT FOURCHON, LA.....	---	129,000	---	129,000
	WALLACE LAKE, LA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WEST SHORE - LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
MARYLAND					
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	690,000	---	690,000	---
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES & CHANNELS, MD & VA.....	---	338,000	---	338,000
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES STUDY, MD.....	415,000	---	415,000	---
	HAVRE DE GRACE, MD.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	OCEAN CITY, MD AND VICINITY.....	108,000	---	108,000	---
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER WATER RESOURCES, MD.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
MASSACHUSETTS					
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
MICHIGAN					
	SAULT STE MARIE, MI.....	---	---	---	100,000
MINNESOTA					
(FC)	CROOKSTON, MN.....	---	400,000	---	400,000
MISSISSIPPI					
(FC)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS.....	---	---	100,000	---
	PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS.....	---	2,640,000	---	100,000
MISSOURI					
	BALLWIN, MO.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	---	656,000	---	656,000
(FDP)	CHESTERFIELD, MO.....	365,000	---	365,000	---
(FDP)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO.....	173,000	---	223,000	---
(RCP)	KANSAS CITY, MO & KS.....	100,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	KIMMSWICK, MO.....	51,000	---	51,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER RIVER DES PERES, MO.....	57,000	---	107,000	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	120,000	---	120,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS — GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING		
NEBRASKA					
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, NE.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
NEVADA					
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION, ..	---	300,000	---	300,000
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION, ..	354,000	---	354,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV.....	177,000	---	177,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV.....	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	NORTH LAS VEGAS, CHANNEL "A", NV.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, RENO, NV.....	300,000	---	---	600,000
(E)	WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV.....	300,000	---	400,000	---
NEW JERSEY					
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ.....	450,000	---	450,000	---
(E)	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ.....	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ.....	72,000	---	72,000	400,000
(SP)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ.....	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS - CAPE MAY POINT, NJ.....	54,000	---	54,000	100,000
(E)	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	---	---	400,000	---
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ.	450,000	---	450,000	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ.....	1,200,000	---	1,500,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	510,000	---	1,510,000	---
(E)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ.....	---	---	---	500,000
(E)	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ.....	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, NJ.....	---	---	100,000	---
NEW MEXICO					
(E)	RIO GRANDE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NM & CO.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
NEW YORK					
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL - HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	---	378,000	---	878,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK, NY.....	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
(E)	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, NY.....	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	BOQUET RIVER BASIN AND TRIBUTARIES, NY.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	CHEMUNG RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NY & PA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY.....	---	---	100,000	---
(SP)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	LINDENHURST, NY.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	MONTAUK POINT, NY.....	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ.....	1,250,000	---	1,250,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGES, NY.....	---	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS — GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING		
(SPE) (BE) (E) (FDP) (FDP) (FDP)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY..... ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NY..... SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY..... SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD. UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY..... UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON RESTORATION, NY.	115,000 --- 150,000 300,000 451,000 200,000	--- --- --- --- --- ---	115,000 300,000 150,000 300,000 451,000 200,000	--- --- --- --- --- ---
NORTH CAROLINA					
(FC) (N) (SP) (N)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC..... CAPE FEAR — NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC..... DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC..... LOCKWOODS FOLLY INLET, NC..... WILMINGTON HARBOR — NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NC.....	--- --- 450,000 --- ---	1,000,000 330,000 --- --- 100,000	--- --- 450,000 100,000 ---	1,000,000 --- --- --- ---
NORTH DAKOTA					
(SPE) (FDP) (FC)	DEVILS LAKE, ND..... GRAND FORKS, ND..... GRAND FORKS / EAST GRAND FORKS, ND & MN.....	1,100,000 128,000 ---	--- --- 178,000	1,100,000 128,000 ---	--- --- 2,678,000
OHIO					
(E) (N)	BELPRE, OH..... GREAT MIAMI RIVER, OXBOW AREA, OH..... MAUMEE RIVER, OH..... OHIO RIVER RIVERFRONT RESTORATION, OH.....	--- 100,000 100,000 ---	--- --- --- ---	150,000 100,000 100,000 100,000	--- --- --- ---
OREGON					
(N) (E) (E) (COM) (E) (MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA.. COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR..... WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA.. WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR..... WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR..... WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR..... TILLAMOOK BAY & ESTUARY, OR.....	724,000 150,000 217,000 420,000 100,000 --- ---	--- --- --- --- --- 520,000 ---	724,000 150,000 217,000 420,000 100,000 100,000 100,000	--- --- --- --- --- 700,000 ---
PENNSYLVANIA					
(E) (E) (FDP) (E) (FC) (RCP)	BEAVER RIVER, PA..... BLOOMSBURG, PA..... CONEMAUGH RVR BASIN, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATI LOWER WEST BR SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIR RESTORATIO MILTON, PA..... SUNBURY, PA..... SUSQUEHANNA RIVER LEVEES, PA..... TIOGA RIVER WATERSHED, PA..... UPPER TURTLE CREEK, PA..... YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, STORAGE REALLOCATION, PA & MD	--- --- 200,000 500,000 --- 200,000 125,000	--- 90,000 --- --- --- --- ---	--- 100,000 500,000 500,000 100,000 500,000 200,000 300,000 125,000	375,000 90,000 --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS — GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE		ALLOWANCE
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	
PUERTO RICO							
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR.....	---	665,000	---	---	665,000	---
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR.....	---	700,000	---	---	700,000	---
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR.....	---	267,000	---	---	267,000	---
RHODE ISLAND							
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST & SRTM DMG REDU PROVIDENCE, RI (FOX PT. HURRICANE BARRIER).....	200,000	---	---	200,000	---	---
SOUTH CAROLINA							
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC.....	500,000	---	---	500,000	---	---
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC.....	100,000	---	---	100,000	---	---
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING).....	---	200,000	---	---	---	---
(N)	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC.....	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(N)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC.....	300,000	---	---	300,000	---	---
(E)	YADKIN-PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC & NC.....	300,000	---	---	300,000	---	---
TENNESSEE							
(FC)	EAST RIDGE, HAMILTON CO, TN.....	---	300,000	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON CO, TN.....	---	150,000	---	---	150,000	---
(FC)	NOLICHUCKY WATERSHED, TN.....	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FC)	NORTH CHICKAMAUGA CREEK WATERSHED, TN.....	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
TEXAS							
(FDP)	ALPINE, TX.....	300,000	---	---	---	---	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	1,830,000	---	---	---	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	800,000	---	---	800,000	---	---
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	937,000	---	---	937,000	---
(E)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX.....	220,000	---	---	220,000	---	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX.....	---	940,000	---	---	940,000	---
(FC)	FORT WORTH SUMPS, 14 & 15, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX.....	---	70,000	---	---	70,000	---
(N)	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX.....	---	324,000	---	---	324,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW - BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX.....	220,000	---	---	220,000	---	---
(RDP)	GIWW - HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX.....	1,000,000	---	---	1,000,000	---	---
(RCP)	GIWW - PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX.....	170,000	---	---	170,000	---	---
(FC)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN).....	---	105,000	---	---	105,000	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	1,000,000	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	HUNTING BAYOU, TX.....	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
(N)	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX.....	---	---	---	510,000	---	---
(FDP)	NECHES RIVER & TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX.....	---	400,000	---	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX.....	130,000	---	---	130,000	---	---
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX.....	179,000	---	---	179,000	---	---
(E)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX.....	211,000	---	---	211,000	---	---
(E)	PACKERY CHANNEL, CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX.....	---	---	---	100,000	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING		
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX.....	---	370,000	---	370,000
(FC)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX.....	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
	WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX.....	---	---	150,000	---
	UTAH				
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(E)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER RESTORATION, UT.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
	VIRGIN ISLANDS				
(N)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI.....	---	270,000	---	270,000
	VERMONT				
	SUMERSET & SEARSBORG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, VT.....	---	---	100,000	---
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, DEEP CREEK, VA.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD JAMES RIVER, VA.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	LAKE MERRIWEATHER, VA.....	---	---	300,000	---
(SPE)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, VA & MD.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	NANSEMOND RIVER BASIN, VA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA.....	---	---	100,000	---
	RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, VA (EMBREY DAM REMOVAL).....	---	---	100,000	---
	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA.....	---	---	200,000	---
	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA.....	---	---	100,000	---
	WASHINGTON				
(N)	BLAIR WATERWAY NAVIGATION STUDY, TACOMA HARBOR, WA.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISE, WA.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER, WA.....	252,000	---	252,000	---
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA.....	---	460,000	---	460,000
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA.....	56,000	---	56,000	---
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA.....	386,000	---	386,000	---
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(SPE)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, WV.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV.....	121,000	---	121,000	---
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	---	672,000	---	1,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS — GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	---	830,000	---	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, FAIRMONT, WV.....	---	---	---	350,000
(E)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV, MD	553,000	---	553,000	---
(E)	TYGART THREE BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WV.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	TYGART VALLEY R B, GRASSY RUN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATIO	100,000	---	100,000	---
	UPPER MONONGAHELA RIVER, WV.....	---	---	100,000	---
	WEST VIRGINA STATEWIDE FLOOD PROTEC PLAN.....	---	---	400,000	---
	WYOMING				
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT.....	650,000	---	650,000	---
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION.....	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES.....	11,690,000	---	8,500,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401).....	---	---	500,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES.....	9,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES.....	340,000	---	340,000	---
	NATIONAL DREDGING NEEDS STUDY OF PORTS AND HARBORS.....	671,000	---	671,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE).....	400,000	---	400,000	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT..	420,000	---	420,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	37,000,000	---	32,000,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS.....	130,000	---	130,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY).....	800,000	---	800,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.....	800,000	---	800,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-26,006,000	---	-34,006,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....	113,898,000	36,102,000	118,588,000	38,216,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
ALABAMA			
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSON	500,000	600,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	3,440,000	3,440,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)...	2,800,000	2,800,000
ALASKA			
	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK.....	---	4,500,000
(N)	COOK INLET, AK.....	---	3,945,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM, AK (SHORELINE EROSION).....	---	1,200,000
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK.....	3,600,000	3,600,000
(N)	ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK.....	---	6,638,000
ARIZONA			
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ.....	2,300,000	2,300,000
	RILLITO RIVER, AZ.....	---	4,000,000
ARKANSAS			
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER, TUCKER CREEK, AR.....	---	300,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)..	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK & DAM, AR.....	10,000,000	20,000,000
CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA.....	9,400,000	9,400,000
	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (NATOMAS), CA.....	---	10,100,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA.....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA.....	---	500,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	19,000,000	19,000,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA.....	11,700,000	20,700,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA.....	16,100,000	26,100,000
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	300,000	2,000,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	7,300,000	9,300,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA.....	1,100,000	5,100,000
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	3,100,000	5,600,000
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA.....	---	1,000,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA.....	8,935,000	8,935,000
	PORT OF LONG BEACH, CA.....	---	6,000,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA.....	8,620,000	8,620,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA.....	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	600,000	600,000
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA.....	---	250,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA.....	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA.....	5,400,000	5,400,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA.....	52,900,000	52,900,000
	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA.....	---	1,500,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
	SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, IMPERIAL BEACH, CA.....	---	500,000
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	200,000	2,750,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA.....	7,500,000	7,500,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO.....	3,298,000	3,298,000
	DELAWARE		
(BE)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE.....	224,000	224,000
	FLORIDA		
	BROWARD COUNTY, FL.....	---	100,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL.....	2,500,000	6,000,000
	CANAVERAL HARBOR DEEPENING, FL.....	---	1,140,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL.....	27,400,000	27,400,000
(BE)	DADE COUNTY, FL.....	8,185,000	9,400,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY, FL.....	278,000	278,000
(FC)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	10,000,000	10,000,000
	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL.....	---	2,261,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL.....	693,000	693,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	6,000,000	6,000,000
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
	LEE COUNTY, FL.....	---	300,000
(BE)	MANATEE COUNTY, FL.....	206,000	206,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL.....	1,872,000	1,872,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL.....	99,000	99,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL.....	2,889,000	5,889,000
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT).....	202,000	3,500,000
	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL.....	---	480,000
	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL.....	---	5,000,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL.....	4,586,000	12,586,000
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL.....	500,000	500,000
	ST JOHNS COUNTY, FL.....	---	300,000
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB).....	900,000	900,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB).....	7,000,000	7,000,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB).....	11,000,000	11,000,000
	TYBEE ISLAND, GA.....	---	2,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
HAWAII			
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR).....	275,000	275,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI.....	691,000	691,000
ILLINOIS			
(FC)	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICT, IL & MO (DEF C	575,000	575,000
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL.	---	500,000
	DES PLAINES RIVER WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, IL..	---	1,000,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL.....	2,800,000	2,800,000
	EAST ST LOUIS AND VICINITY (INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL), I	---	300,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	4,370,000	5,370,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	4,230,000	4,230,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL.....	500,000	500,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO.....	1,900,000	1,900,000
	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL.....	---	539,000
	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL.....	---	2,100,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL & KY.....	98,440,000	98,440,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL (DEF CORR).....	5,262,000	5,262,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MO, MN	14,000,000	16,000,000
INDIANA			
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN (MAJOR REHAB).....	3,000,000	4,400,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN.....	5,300,000	5,800,000
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN.....	---	3,000,000
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN.....	---	5,000,000
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN.....	---	3,500,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN.....	5,300,000	5,300,000
	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN.....	---	1,300,000
	WABASH RIVER, NEW HARMONY, IN.....	---	500,000
IOWA			
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)..	6,600,000	6,600,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	3,895,000	3,895,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA.....	8,255,000	8,255,000
KANSAS			
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS.....	2,000,000	2,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY).....	250,000	250,000
	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, KY.....	---	4,000,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS & DAMS, KY & IN.....	1,720,000	6,720,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY.....	1,800,000	1,800,000
	SALYERSVILLE, KY.....	---	2,050,000
	SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY.....	---	3,000,000
LOUISIANA			
(FC)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE, LA.....	1,510,000	1,510,000
	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA.....	---	1,000,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	6,448,000	22,920,000
	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORMWATER DISCHARGE, LA.....	---	3,000,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)....	541,000	541,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA.....	2,018,000	2,018,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	1,793,000	2,593,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION).....	1,700,000	1,700,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM (TWELVEMILE BAYOU), LA....	---	1,000,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	9,990,000	16,490,000
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA.....	6,440,000	47,000,000
(FC)	WEST BANK - EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTEC	2,385,000	2,385,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)...	4,300,000	5,041,000
MARYLAND			
(FC)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC.....	4,400,000	4,400,000
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD.....	1,797,000	1,797,000
	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRON. RESTORATION & PROT. PROG., MD.	---	1,000,000
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD.....	542,000	542,000
(SPEC)	CUMBERLAND, MD (SEC. 535 WRDA 96).....	---	375,000
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD.....	30,621,000	25,621,000
MASSACHUSETTS			
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA.....	3,920,000	6,000,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB).....	7,900,000	7,900,000
(FC)	ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA.....	1,880,000	1,880,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA.....	700,000	700,000
MONTANA			
	NORTH FORK, FLATHEAD RIVER, MT. (SEC 584		
	MONITORING STATION).....	---	50,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
MINNESOTA			
	KNIFE RIVER HARBOR, MN.....	---	150,000
(FDP)	ST. CROIX RIVER, STILLWATER, MN.....	---	1,000,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)...	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN.....	500,000	500,000
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY).....	300,000	300,000
MISSISSIPPI			
(FDP)	JACKSON COUNTY, MS.....	---	3,000,000
(FDP)	NATCHEZ BLUFF, MS.....	---	4,000,000
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER VICINITY OF WALKIAK BLUFF, MS.....	---	2,000,000
	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS.....	---	800,000
MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	17,900,000	17,900,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON, MO.....	1,800,000	1,800,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO.....	2,347,000	2,347,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	3,446,000	3,446,000
(FC)	ST GENEVIEVE, MO.....	4,145,000	5,145,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY).....	800,000	800,000
NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.....	150,000	150,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE.....	500,000	500,000
NEVADA			
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV.....	20,000,000	20,000,000
NEW JERSEY			
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ.....	280,000	280,000
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ.....	3,076,000	3,076,000
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	7,090,000	7,090,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHNLS, PORT JERSEY CHNL, NJ	---	600,000
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	3,500,000	3,500,000
	PASSAIC RIVER STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ.....	---	3,000,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ.....	277,000	2,500,000
	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ.....	---	200,000
	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ.....	---	3,100,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	15,116,000	15,116,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM.....	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM.....	600,000	1,000,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM.....	400,000	400,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY).....	2,720,000	2,720,000
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, NM.....	300,000	1,500,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	560,000	560,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE..	280,000	280,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY).....	2,563,000	2,563,000
NEW YORK			
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	1,000,000	1,000,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	600,000	600,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY.....	285,000	285,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY.....	4,802,000	4,802,000
	HUDSON RIVER, ATHENS, NY.....	---	8,700,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ.....	429,000	929,000
(BE)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY.....	---	2,000,000
	ORCHARD BEACH, NY.....	---	400,000
	NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY.....	---	5,000,000
	NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM, NY.....	---	2,000,000
NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW - REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
(BE)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC.....	2,840,000	2,840,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, NC.....	3,700,000	2,430,000
(BE)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC.....	1,070,000	1,070,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
	BUFORD - TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT, ND.....	---	2,000,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB).....	300,000	300,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY).....	200,000	200,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY).....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB).....	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND.....	500,000	500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
OHIO			
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	105,000	105,000
(FC)	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH.....	1,890,000	1,890,000
	LOWER GIRARD DAM, OH.....	---	1,500,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH.....	2,120,000	2,120,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH.....	2,518,000	2,518,000
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH.....	15,181,000	15,181,000
OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK.....	3,928,000	3,928,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY).....	95,000	95,000
OREGON			
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB).	13,000,000	13,000,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA...	8,400,000	8,400,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR.....	3,900,000	3,900,000
PENNSYLVANIA			
(N)	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	250,000	2,900,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB).....	6,205,000	6,369,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA.....	400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA.....	425,000	5,425,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	2,700,000	12,700,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT).....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA.....	500,000	500,000
	SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, PA.....	---	30,000,000
	SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA, PA.....	---	1,000,000
	SUNBURY, PA.....	---	200,000
	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PA.....	---	400,000
	WILLIAMSPORT, PA.....	---	225,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING).....	13,000,000	13,000,000
PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR.....	12,712,000	12,712,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR.....	510,000	510,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR.....	11,868,000	11,868,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR.....	2,400,000	2,400,000
SOUTH CAROLINA			
	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	---	2,000,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	1,869,000	1,869,000
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC.....	10,000,000	10,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
TENNESSEE			
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLANDS SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN..	---	2,900,000
	EAST RIDGE, TN.....	---	500,000
	TENNESSEE RIVER, HAMILTON COUNTY, TN.....	---	1,500,000
TEXAS			
	BRAYS BAYOU, TX.....	---	2,000,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.....	7,300,000	7,300,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX.....	750,000	750,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX.....	5,290,000	5,290,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX.....	4,900,000	4,900,000
	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX.....	---	3,000,000
(N)	GIWW - SARGENT BEACH, TX.....	940,000	940,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX.....	15,000,000	20,000,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX.....	3,291,000	3,291,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM (BOWIE COUNTY LEVEE), TX..	---	900,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX.....	390,000	1,600,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	9,590,000	13,000,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY).....	1,700,000	1,700,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX.....	---	9,200,000
UTAH			
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT.....	---	1,000,000
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT.....	700,000	700,000
VIRGINIA			
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA.....	1,526,000	1,526,000
	LYNCHBURG COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA.....	---	1,000,000
	NEABSCO CREEK, VA.....	---	800,000
	NORFOLK HARBOR (50-FOOT ANCHORAGE), VA.....	---	1,200,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA.....	1,098,000	1,098,000
	RICHMOND COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA.....	---	1,000,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA.....	4,400,000	4,400,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.....	---	13,000,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT).....	---	925,000
WASHINGTON			
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID.....	127,000,000	95,000,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	4,000,000	4,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE

WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV.....	---	1,500,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	7,927,000	58,267,000
	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	---	1,830,000
(FDP)	LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WV.....	---	100,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH.....	5,356,000	5,356,000
	SOUTHERN WV ENVIRONMEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, WV.....	---	2,000,000
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY).....	1,000,000	1,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV & PA.	---	3,000,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	8,500,000	8,500,000
WISCONSIN			
	LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI.....	---	713,000
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM.....	2,600,000	5,000,000
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206).....	2,000,000	6,000,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103).....	3,000,000	3,000,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204).....	2,000,000	2,000,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT (SECTION 208).....	500,000	2,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14).	7,500,000	11,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION.....	18,048,000	18,048,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.....	---	5,000,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205).....	25,500,000	40,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE.....	40,000	40,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE.....	185,000	185,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111).....	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	5,000,000	11,400,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	14,175,000	21,175,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-45,863,000	-69,574,000
		=====	=====
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL.....		1,062,470,000	1,473,373,000
		=====	=====

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
SURVEYS:			
GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN & MS.....	800,000	800,000
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO.....	1,070,000	2,570,000
	RAPIDES AND ST. LANDRY PARISHES, LA.....	---	100,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN & KY.....	335,000	335,000
	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR.....	---	500,000
(FDP)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN.....	465,000	465,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA.....	345,000	345,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....		3,015,000	5,115,000
CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.....	44,490,000	44,490,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR.....	812,000	812,000
(FC)	HELENA & VICINITY, AR.....	700,000	700,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	24,238,000	31,000,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR.....	1,105,000	1,105,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA.....	3,300,000	3,300,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.....	19,100,000	21,100,000
	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA.....	---	900,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS....	300,000	300,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA.....	11,500,000	13,500,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.....	7,006,000	7,006,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(25,470,000)	(32,970,000)
(FC)	BACKWATER LESS ROCKY BAYOU, MS.....	20,000	520,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS.....	3,862,000	3,862,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS.....	10,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS.....	363,000	363,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS.....	200,000	200,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS.....	9,000,000	11,000,000
(FC)	ST. JOHNS BAYOU - NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN & MS.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN.....	2,200,000	2,200,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION.....		150,221,000	169,383,000
MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.....	56,112,000	59,162,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS CO, AR.....	280,000	280,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR.....	472,000	472,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR.....	840,000	840,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR.....	124,000	124,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	7,252,000	7,252,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO.....	8,130,000	8,130,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA.....	2,807,000	2,807,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL.....	49,000	49,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY.....	27,000	27,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA.....	670,000	670,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.....	10,700,000	12,700,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA.....	150,000	150,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA.....	92,000	92,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA.....	390,000	390,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA.....	378,000	378,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA.....	377,000	377,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA.....	4,390,000	4,390,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.....	2,891,000	2,891,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS.....	361,000	361,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS.....	203,000	203,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS.....	237,000	237,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(21,902,000)	(25,802,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS.....	3,514,000	3,514,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS.....	237,000	2,237,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS.....	3,556,000	3,556,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS.....	816,000	816,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS.....	4,662,000	4,662,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS.....	1,151,000	1,151,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS.....	4,766,000	6,666,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS.....	1,343,000	1,343,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS.....	498,000	498,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS.....	524,000	524,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS.....	835,000	835,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO.....	220,000	220,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO.....	7,468,000	7,468,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN.....	124,000	124,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN.....	1,345,000	1,345,000
(FC)	MAPPING.....	1,027,000	1,027,000
	REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-18,754,000	-18,754,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE.....	112,764,000	121,714,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.....	266,000,000	296,212,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
ALABAMA			
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL.....	4,903,000	4,903,000
	BAYOU CODEN, AL.....	---	5,000
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL.....	5,000	705,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOBIBGEE RIVERS, AL.....	16,252,000	18,252,000
(N)	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL.....	500,000	752,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL.....	3,677,000	3,677,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL.....	30,000	30,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	5,835,000	6,335,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL.....	17,936,000	19,936,000
	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL.....	---	300,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL.....	300,000	300,000
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL.....	3,858,000	4,389,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL.....	20,000	20,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOBIBGEE WATERWAY, AL & MS.....	16,058,000	18,713,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA.....	6,044,000	7,544,000
ALASKA			
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK.....	1,400,000	1,400,000
(N)	BETHEL HARBOR, AK.....	20,000	20,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK.....	1,766,000	2,566,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK.....	459,000	459,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK.....	245,000	245,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK.....	27,000	27,000
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK.....	200,000	200,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK.....	260,000	260,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK.....	565,000	565,000
(N)	WRANGELL NARROWS, AK.....	400,000	400,000
ARIZONA			
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ.....	1,055,000	1,055,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ.....	107,000	107,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ.....	2,293,000	2,293,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ.....	22,000	22,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ.....	199,000	199,000
ARKANSAS			
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR.....	3,918,000	3,918,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR.....	4,632,000	4,632,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR.....	1,105,000	1,105,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR.....	4,810,000	4,810,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR.....	5,679,000	5,679,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR.....	3,959,000	3,959,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR.....	1,012,000	2,000,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR.....	1,015,000	1,015,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR.....	946,000	946,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR.....	4,241,000	4,241,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, AR.....	283,000	283,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR.....	210,000	210,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.....	21,604,000	21,604,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR.....	1,647,000	1,647,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR.....	3,568,000	3,568,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR.....	1,284,000	1,284,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR.....	3,183,000	3,183,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR.....	311,000	311,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA.....	5,179,000	5,179,000
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR.....	3,789,000	3,789,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR.....	5,000	5,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR.....	2,265,000	2,265,000
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR.....	120,000	120,000
CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA.....	1,587,000	1,587,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA.....	1,372,000	1,372,000
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA.....	2,718,000	2,718,000
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA.....	1,140,000	1,140,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA.....	3,451,000	3,451,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA.....	281,000	281,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA.....	1,371,000	1,371,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA.....	3,775,000	3,775,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA.....	1,326,000	1,326,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA.....	1,413,000	1,413,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA.....	165,000	165,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA.....	4,288,000	5,288,000
	MARINA DEL RAY, CA.....	---	500,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA.....	252,000	252,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA.....	307,000	307,000
	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA.....	---	3,200,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA.....	2,110,000	2,110,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA.....	938,000	938,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA.....	3,146,000	4,350,000
	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA.....	---	900,000
(N)	PETALUMA RIVER, CA.....	2,090,000	2,090,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA.....	1,968,000	1,968,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA.....	1,615,000	1,615,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA.....	2,667,000	2,667,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA.....	1,778,000	1,778,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.....	884,000	884,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA.....	133,000	133,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA.....	175,000	175,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA.....	1,787,000	1,787,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA.....	2,309,000	2,309,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA.....	2,267,000	2,267,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA.....	1,494,000	1,494,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA.....	1,680,000	1,680,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	2,762,000	2,762,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA.....	1,492,000	1,492,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA.....	968,000	968,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA.....	1,573,000	1,573,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA.....	952,000	952,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA.....	2,073,000	2,073,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA.....	2,236,000	2,236,000
COLORADO			
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO.....	361,000	361,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO.....	715,000	715,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO.....	945,000	945,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO.....	110,000	110,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO.....	1,595,000	1,595,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO.....	368,000	368,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO.....	627,000	627,000
CONNECTICUT			
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT.....	400,000	400,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT.....	558,000	558,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT.....	199,000	199,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT.....	843,000	843,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT.....	35,000	35,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT.....	360,000	360,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT.....	401,000	401,000
(N)	PATCHOGUE RIVER, CT.....	466,000	466,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT.....	1,241,000	1,241,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT.....	351,000	351,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT.....	489,000	489,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT.....	395,000	395,000
DELAWARE			
(N)	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL - ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	11,794,000	11,794,000
(N)	MISPILLION RIVER, DE.....	165,000	165,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE.....	50,000	50,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE.....	2,360,000	2,360,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC.....	6,000	6,000
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC.....	840,000	840,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC.....	32,000	32,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC.....	35,000	35,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
FLORIDA			
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & VA..	30,000	30,000
	ANCLOTE RIVER, FL.....	---	1,500,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL.....	6,460,000	6,460,000
(N)	CARRABELLE HARBOR, FL.....	520,000	520,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL.....	9,500,000	9,500,000
	CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL.....	---	2,000,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL.....	1,536,000	1,536,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL.....	717,000	717,000
	HORSESHOE COVE, FL.....	---	1,000,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL.....	50,000	50,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R..	47,000	47,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL.....	2,909,000	2,909,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	5,961,000	7,500,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,399,000	5,399,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL.....	408,000	408,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL.....	3,503,000	3,503,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL.....	1,079,000	1,079,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL.....	700,000	700,000
(N)	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL.....	50,000	50,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL.....	5,000	5,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL.....	410,000	410,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL.....	3,032,000	3,032,000
(N)	ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL.....	10,000	10,000
(N)	STEINHATCHEE RIVER, FL.....	5,000	5,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL.....	6,607,000	6,607,000
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL.....	34,000	34,000
GEORGIA			
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA.....	4,628,000	4,628,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &.	4,741,000	6,500,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA.....	1,783,000	1,783,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	3,030,000	3,030,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA.....	6,179,000	6,179,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA.....	4,500,000	4,500,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC.....	9,547,000	9,547,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA.....	40,000	40,000
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC.....	8,982,000	8,982,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC.....	7,520,000	7,520,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA.....	8,053,000	14,500,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA.....	207,000	207,000
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL.....	4,631,000	4,631,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
HAWAII			
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI.....	84,000	84,000
(N)	HALEIWA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI.....	334,000	334,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI.....	188,000	188,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI.....	415,000	415,000
(N)	WAIANAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI.....	334,000	334,000
IDAHO			
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID.....	4,775,000	4,775,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID.....	7,866,000	7,866,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID.....	89,000	89,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID.....	1,087,000	1,087,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID.....	193,000	193,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ID.....	64,000	64,000
ILLINOIS			
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN.....	717,000	717,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL.....	3,908,000	3,908,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL.....	4,545,000	4,545,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL.....	343,000	343,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL.....	294,000	294,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL.....	1,310,000	1,310,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL & IN.....	22,738,000	22,738,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL.....	657,000	657,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL.....	1,433,000	1,633,000
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL.....	796,000	796,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL.....	4,820,000	4,820,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	10,535,000	10,535,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &	81,363,000	81,363,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL.....	110,000	110,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL.....	3,451,000	3,451,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL.....	129,000	129,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL.....	643,000	643,000
INDIANA			
	BEVERLY SHORES, IN.....	---	1,700,000
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN.....	754,000	754,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN.....	902,000	902,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN.....	709,000	709,000
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN.....	715,000	715,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN.....	1,242,000	1,242,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN.....	732,000	732,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN.....	133,000	133,000
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN.....	56,000	56,000
(FC)	MISSISSINAWA LAKE, IN.....	975,000	975,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN.....	778,000	778,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN.....	739,000	739,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN.....	30,000	30,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN.....	832,000	832,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN.....	120,000	120,000
IOWA			
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA.....	2,731,000	2,731,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA.....	183,000	183,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA..	152,000	152,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	6,496,000	6,496,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA.....	1,746,000	1,746,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA.....	3,291,000	3,291,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA.....	4,191,000	4,191,000
KANSAS			
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS.....	1,482,000	1,482,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS.....	1,003,000	1,003,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS.....	488,000	488,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS.....	699,000	699,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS.....	772,000	772,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS.....	790,000	790,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS.....	250,000	250,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS.....	1,019,000	1,019,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS.....	1,219,000	1,219,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS.....	1,630,000	1,630,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS.....	1,580,000	1,580,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS.....	1,537,000	1,537,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS.....	799,000	799,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS.....	1,673,000	1,673,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS.....	1,533,000	1,533,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS.....	178,000	178,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS.....	364,000	364,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS.....	1,858,000	1,858,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS.....	1,349,000	1,349,000
KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN.....	8,127,000	8,127,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,918,000	1,918,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY.....	1,120,000	1,120,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY.....	1,309,000	1,309,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE, KY.....	1,374,000	1,374,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY.....	908,000	908,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY.....	1,167,000	1,167,000
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY.....	334,000	334,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY.....	1,602,000	1,602,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY.....	1,014,000	1,014,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY.....	1,915,000	1,915,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,759,000	1,759,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY.....	137,000	137,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY.....	4,843,000	4,843,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,233,000	1,233,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY.....	22,000	22,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY.....	654,000	654,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY.....	52,000	52,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY.....	1,795,000	1,795,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV....	53,126,000	53,126,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	5,889,000	5,889,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY.....	878,000	878,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY.....	5,000	5,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,669,000	1,669,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY.....	1,086,000	1,086,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY.....	4,290,000	6,790,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY.....	1,111,000	1,111,000
LOUISIANA			
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	10,436,000	10,436,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA.....	505,000	505,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA.....	466,000	466,000
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA.....	5,000	5,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA.....	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA.....	10,000	10,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA.....	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA.....	172,000	172,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA.....	78,000	78,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA.....	6,480,000	6,680,000
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA.....	2,452,000	2,452,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX.....	15,015,000	15,015,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA.....	826,000	826,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA.....	414,000	414,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA.....	371,000	371,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA.....	56,000	56,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA.....	1,143,000	1,143,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA.	41,000,000	48,100,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA.....	10,998,000	14,498,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA.....	---	2,400,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA.....	144,000	144,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	7,714,000	10,192,000
(FC)	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA.....	1,960,000	1,960,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA.....	152,000	152,000
(N)	WATERWAY - EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA.....	765,000	765,000
(N)	WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA....	335,000	335,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
MAINE			
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME.....	15,000	15,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME.....	722,000	722,000
MARYLAND			
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD (50 FT).....	12,025,000	12,025,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD.....	425,000	425,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	560,000	560,000
(N)	CHESTER RIVER, MD.....	65,000	65,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV.....	111,000	111,000
(N)	HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD.....	677,000	677,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD.....	28,000	28,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV.....	1,528,000	1,528,000
(N)	LOWER THOROFARE, DEAL ISLAND, MD.....	63,000	63,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD....	47,000	47,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD.....	306,000	306,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD.....	79,000	79,000
(N)	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD.....	2,600,000	2,600,000
(N)	UPPER THOROFARE, MD.....	53,000	53,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD.....	829,000	829,000
MASSACHUSETTS			
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA.....	340,000	340,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA.....	385,000	385,000
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA.....	16,500,000	16,500,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA.....	359,000	359,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA.....	8,855,000	8,855,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA.....	156,000	156,000
	COHASSET HARBOR, MA.....	---	1,500,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA.....	138,000	138,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA.....	327,000	327,000
(N)	GREEN HARBOR, MA.....	296,000	296,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA.....	348,000	348,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA.....	78,000	78,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA.....	527,000	527,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA.....	459,000	459,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,..	242,000	242,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA.....	1,117,000	1,117,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MA.....	16,000	16,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA.....	391,000	391,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA.....	415,000	415,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA.....	488,000	488,000
MICHIGAN			
(N)	ALPENA HARBOR, MI.....	324,000	324,000
	CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI.....	---	2,377,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI.....	805,000	805,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI.....	475,000	475,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI.....	2,839,000	2,839,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI.....	210,000	210,000
	FLINT RIVER, MI.....	---	875,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI.....	1,129,000	1,129,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI.....	359,000	359,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI.....	392,000	392,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI.....	205,000	205,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI.....	976,000	976,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI.....	607,000	607,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI.....	276,000	276,000
(N)	MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI.....	60,000	60,000
(N)	MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI.....	257,000	257,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI.....	337,000	337,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI.....	316,000	316,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI.....	157,000	157,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI.....	407,000	407,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI.....	1,579,000	1,579,000
(N)	PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI.....	21,000	21,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI.....	211,000	211,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI.....	134,000	134,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI.....	1,291,000	1,291,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI.....	10,000	10,000
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI.....	1,014,000	1,014,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI.....	587,000	587,000
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI.....	17,744,000	17,744,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI.....	2,353,000	2,353,000
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI.....	1,585,000	1,585,000
MINNESOTA			
	ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY PROJECT, DULUTH, MN.....	---	200,000
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD.....	184,000	184,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI.....	3,749,000	3,749,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN.....	103,000	103,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN.....	549,000	549,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN.....	150,000	150,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN.....	930,000	930,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN.....	70,000	70,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN.....	175,000	175,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN.....	2,677,000	2,677,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN.....	239,000	239,000
MISSISSIPPI			
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS.....	464,000	464,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS.....	158,000	158,000
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS.....	120,000	120,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS.....	2,121,000	2,121,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS.....	114,000	114,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS.....	79,000	79,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS.....	2,620,000	2,620,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA.....	391,000	391,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS.....	5,000	5,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS.....	406,000	406,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS.....	15,000	15,000
MISSOURI			
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO.....	176,000	176,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO.....	4,677,000	5,000,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO.....	1,991,000	2,341,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO.....	8,006,000	8,006,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO.....	399,000	399,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO.....	867,000	867,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO.....	889,000	889,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	14,839,000	14,839,000
(N)	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO.....	21,000	21,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO.....	1,668,000	1,668,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO.....	5,000	5,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO.....	1,063,000	1,063,000
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO.....	275,000	275,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO.....	2,988,000	2,988,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO.....	4,576,000	4,576,000
(FC)	UNION LAKE, MO.....	5,000	5,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO.....	20,000	20,000
MONTANA			
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT.....	3,664,000	3,664,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT.....	23,000	23,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT.....	6,517,000	6,517,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT.....	53,000	53,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MT.....	69,000	69,000
NEBRASKA			
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD.....	5,469,000	5,469,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE.....	1,395,000	1,395,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE.....	164,000	164,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE.....	---	200,000
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO..	1,800,000	1,800,000
(MP)	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING, NE.	250,000	250,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE.....	690,000	690,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE.....	854,000	854,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE.....	116,000	116,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
NEVADA			
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA.....	480,000	480,000
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV.....	145,000	145,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH.....	404,000	404,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH.....	456,000	456,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH.....	813,000	813,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH.....	973,000	973,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH.....	10,000	10,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH.....	478,000	478,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH.....	161,000	161,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH.....	616,000	616,000
NEW JERSEY			
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	1,050,000	1,050,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ.....	375,000	375,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ.....	20,000	20,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE..	15,098,000	15,098,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ.....	1,480,000	1,480,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ.....	443,000	443,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ.....	2,040,000	2,040,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ.....	670,000	5,710,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ.....	1,021,000	1,021,000
(N)	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ.....	250,000	250,000
	TUCKERTON CREEK, NJ.....	---	650,000
NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM.....	1,295,000	1,295,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM.....	1,922,000	1,922,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM.....	1,081,000	1,081,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM.....	299,000	299,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM.....	66,000	66,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM.....	457,000	457,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM.....	891,000	891,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM.....	64,000	64,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM.....	323,000	323,000
	UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL.....	---	1,000,000
NEW YORK			
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY.....	435,000	435,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY.....	218,000	218,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY.....	4,350,000	4,350,000
(N)	BRONX RIVER, NY.....	600,000	600,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY.....	1,550,000	1,550,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
	BUFFALO HARBOR ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY.....	---	125,000
(N)	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY.....	220,000	220,000
(N)	CATSKILL CREEK, NY.....	20,000	20,000
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY.....	545,000	545,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY.....	483,000	483,000
(N)	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY.....	650,000	650,000
(N)	FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY.....	155,000	155,000
(N)	GLEN COVE CREEK, NY.....	540,000	540,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY.....	3,275,000	3,275,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY.....	549,000	549,000
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY.....	100,000	100,000
	MAMARONECK HARBOR, NY.....	---	4,500,000
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY.....	1,385,000	1,385,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY.....	800,000	32,000,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ.....	4,800,000	4,800,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),..	730,000	730,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY.....	7,764,000	7,764,000
	OWASCO OUTLET, NY.....	---	250,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY.....	1,504,000	1,504,000
(N)	RONDOUT HARBOR, NY.....	1,245,000	1,245,000
	SAG HARBOR, NY.....	---	90,000
(N)	SAUGERTIES HARBOR, NY.....	20,000	20,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY.....	526,000	526,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY.....	651,000	651,000
(N)	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY.....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY.....	627,000	627,000
NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC.....	5,438,000	5,438,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC.....	973,000	973,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC.....	590,000	590,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC.....	648,000	648,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC.....	1,340,000	1,340,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC.....	867,000	867,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC.....	22,000	22,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC.....	375,000	375,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.....	5,074,000	5,074,000
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC.....	2,200,000	2,200,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC.....	2,672,000	2,672,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC.....	650,000	650,000
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC.....	180,000	180,000
(N)	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC.....	100,000	100,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC.....	59,000	59,000
(N)	ROANOKE RIVER, NC.....	100,000	100,000
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC.....	1,468,000	1,468,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC.....	5,834,000	5,834,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
NORTH DAKOTA			
	SD & NE, BTID (SEC. 33).....	---	750,000
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND.....	194,000	194,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND.....	9,143,000	9,193,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND.....	188,000	188,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND.....	60,000	60,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND.....	1,149,000	1,149,000
	MISSOURI RIVER BETION FT. PECK, MT & GAVINS FT. DAM...	---	750,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND.....	395,000	395,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND.....	188,000	188,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND.....	30,000	30,000
OHIO			
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH.....	616,000	616,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH.....	1,175,000	1,175,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH.....	2,368,000	2,368,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,153,000	1,153,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH.....	726,000	726,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH.....	6,560,000	6,560,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH.....	1,358,000	1,358,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH.....	678,000	678,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH.....	814,000	814,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH.....	501,000	501,000
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH.....	400,000	400,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH.....	1,035,000	1,035,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH.....	220,000	220,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH.....	1,325,000	1,325,000
	MAHONING RIVER, OH.....	---	1,000,000
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH.....	882,000	882,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH.....	965,000	965,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH.....	6,060,000	6,060,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH.....	311,000	311,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH.....	569,000	569,000
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH.....	75,000	75,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH.....	74,000	74,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH.....	30,000	30,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH.....	1,015,000	1,015,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH.....	206,000	206,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH.....	3,575,000	3,575,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH.....	245,000	245,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH.....	546,000	546,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH.....	846,000	846,000
OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK.....	277,000	277,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK.....	836,000	836,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK.....	1,671,000	1,671,000
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK.....	39,000	39,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK.....	1,756,000	1,756,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK.....	906,000	906,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK.....	3,959,000	3,959,000
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK.....	3,354,000	3,354,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK.....	817,000	817,000
	GRAND NEOSHO RIVER BASIN, OK.....	---	500,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK.....	323,000	323,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK.....	813,000	813,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK.....	1,510,000	1,510,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK.....	462,000	462,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK.....	168,000	168,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK.....	1,735,000	1,735,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK.....	3,453,000	3,453,000
(FC)	OLOGAH LAKE, OK.....	1,329,000	1,329,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK.....	265,000	265,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK.....	20,000	20,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK.....	1,088,000	1,088,000
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK.....	3,795,000	3,795,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK.....	1,037,000	1,037,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK.....	558,000	558,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK.....	949,000	949,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK.....	3,423,000	3,423,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK.....	1,486,000	1,486,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK.....	3,288,000	3,288,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK.....	824,000	824,000
OREGON			
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR.....	787,000	787,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR.....	276,000	276,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	16,576,000	16,691,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR.....	284,000	500,000
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA.....	11,332,000	11,332,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA.....	7,904,000	7,904,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O.....	346,000	346,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR.....	4,892,000	4,892,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR.....	377,000	377,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR.....	708,000	708,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR.....	1,157,000	1,157,000
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR.....	33,000	33,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR.....	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR.....	512,000	512,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR.....	618,000	618,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR.....	955,000	955,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR.....	2,545,000	2,545,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR.....	748,000	748,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR.....	179,000	179,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	12,886,000	12,886,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR.....	3,991,000	3,991,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR.....	4,030,000	4,030,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	12,333,000	12,483,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR.....	484,000	484,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR.....	135,000	135,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR.....	746,000	1,353,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR.....	115,000	115,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR.....	965,000	965,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR.....	5,000	5,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR.....	7,000	7,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR.....	13,000	13,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR.....	1,321,000	1,321,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR.....	606,000	606,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR.....	61,000	61,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OR.....	---	647,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR.....	564,000	564,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR.....	1,607,000	1,607,000
PENNSYLVANIA			
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA.....	6,700,000	12,700,000
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA.....	622,000	622,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA.....	200,000	225,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA.....	1,046,000	1,046,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA.....	1,986,000	1,986,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA.....	3,127,000	3,127,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA.....	1,679,000	1,679,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA.....	1,452,000	1,452,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA.....	677,000	804,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA.....	799,000	799,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA.....	635,000	635,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA.....	728,000	728,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA.....	715,000	715,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA.....	287,000	287,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA.....	205,000	205,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA.....	1,109,000	1,109,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA.....	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA.....	1,182,000	1,182,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA.....	826,000	826,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	13,864,000	13,864,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA.....	15,000	15,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA.....	438,000	438,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA.....	13,000	13,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA.....	2,520,000	4,690,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA.....	53,000	53,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA.....	1,290,000	1,290,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA.....	1,916,000	1,916,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA.....	334,000	334,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA.....	82,000	82,000
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA.....	1,775,000	2,155,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA.....	1,293,000	1,293,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA.....	324,000	324,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA.....	821,000	821,000
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA.....	518,000	518,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD.....	1,663,000	1,663,000
RHODE ISLAND			
(N)	BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI.....	342,000	342,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI.....	5,000	5,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI.....	677,000	677,000
SOUTH CAROLINA			
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC.....	2,850,000	2,850,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	3,815,000	4,715,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	3,372,000	3,562,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC.....	246,000	246,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC.....	3,165,000	3,665,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC.....	27,000	27,000
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC.....	981,000	981,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC.....	20,000	20,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC.....	400,000	400,000
	TOWN CREEK, SC.....	---	360,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD.....	5,759,000	5,759,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD.....	325,000	325,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD.....	200,000	200,000
(MP)	FT RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD.....	7,863,000	7,863,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD.....	14,000	14,000
	JAMES RIVER, JAMESTOWN & PIPESTEM RESERV., SD.....	---	100,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN.....	1,499,000	1,499,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND.....	8,854,000	9,154,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD.....	67,000	67,000
TENNESSEE			
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN.....	5,373,000	5,373,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN.....	4,832,000	4,832,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN.....	4,097,000	4,097,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN.....	3,622,000	3,622,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN.....	133,000	133,000
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN.....	3,348,000	3,348,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN.....	6,404,000	6,404,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN.....	4,000	4,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN.....	10,266,000	10,266,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN.....	310,000	310,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
TEXAS			
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX.....	602,000	602,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,185,000	1,185,000
(N)	BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX.....	845,000	845,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX.....	1,301,000	1,301,000
(N)	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	1,170,000	1,170,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX.....	2,650,000	2,650,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX.....	1,660,000	1,660,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX.....	1,050,000	1,050,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX.....	3,457,000	3,457,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX.....	2,052,000	2,052,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX.....	155,000	155,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX.....	978,000	978,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	1,885,000	1,885,000
	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (RINCON CANAL), TX.....	---	400,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX.....	4,681,000	4,681,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX.....	14,000	14,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX.....	2,113,000	2,113,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX.....	4,350,000	4,350,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX.....	3,010,000	3,010,000
(N)	GIWW - CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.....	1,940,000	1,940,000
(N)	GIWW - CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX.....	1,160,000	1,160,000
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	1,517,000	1,517,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX.....	1,804,000	1,804,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX.....	17,072,000	17,072,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX.....	1,133,000	1,133,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	7,617,000	7,617,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX.....	296,000	296,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX.....	817,000	817,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX.....	235,000	235,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX.....	2,476,000	2,476,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX.....	2,467,000	2,467,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	3,460,000	3,460,000
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX.....	1,900,000	1,900,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX.....	1,373,000	1,373,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX.....	1,650,000	1,650,000
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	1,287,000	1,287,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX.....	856,000	856,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX.....	2,197,000	2,197,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX.....	85,000	85,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX.....	768,000	768,000
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX.....	8,020,000	8,020,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX.....	4,038,000	4,038,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX.....	49,000	49,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX.....	2,367,000	2,367,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX.....	1,514,000	1,514,000
(N)	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	770,000	770,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM - B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX.....	1,469,000	1,469,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX.....	2,031,000	2,031,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX.....	488,000	488,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX.....	3,628,000	3,628,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	2,446,000	2,446,000
UTAH			
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT.....	58,000	58,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT.....	452,000	452,000
VERMONT			
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT.....	606,000	606,000
	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN (MASTER PLAN), VT.....	---	200,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT.....	40,000	40,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY.....	556,000	556,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT.....	672,000	672,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT.....	570,000	570,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT.....	602,000	602,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT.....	439,000	439,000
VIRGINIA			
(N)	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA.....	25,000	25,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA.....	1,971,000	1,971,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA.....	485,000	485,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA.....	1,094,000	1,094,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA.....	1,544,000	1,544,000
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	707,000	707,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA.....	69,000	69,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA.....	3,635,000	5,000,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC.....	7,906,000	7,906,000
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA.....	1,192,000	1,192,000
	NEABSCO CREEK, VA.....	---	1,000,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	280,000	280,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA.....	5,310,000	5,310,000
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA.....	301,000	301,000
	POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA.....	---	174,000
	POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC, VA.....	---	176,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA.....	2,075,000	2,075,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA.....	711,000	711,000
	RUDEE INLET, VA.....	---	535,000
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA.....	177,000	177,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA.....	1,082,000	1,082,000
WASHINGTON			
(N)	ANACORTES HARBOR, WA.....	240,000	240,000
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA.....	12,547,000	12,547,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR.....	10,000	10,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA....	6,000	6,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA.....	1,202,000	1,202,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA.....	7,226,000	13,226,000
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA.....	1,271,000	1,271,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	8,090,000	8,090,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA.....	173,000	173,000
(N)	LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA.....	352,000	352,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA.....	6,558,000	6,558,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	5,672,000	5,672,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	7,684,000	7,684,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	5,461,000	5,461,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA.....	762,000	762,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS, WA.....	415,000	415,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA.....	1,953,000	1,953,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA.....	294,000	294,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA.....	1,050,000	1,050,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA.....	492,000	492,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA.....	787,000	787,000
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA.....	186,000	186,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA.....	61,000	61,000
(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA.....	375,000	375,000
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA.....	72,000	72,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR.....	10,744,000	10,744,000
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA.....	615,000	2,615,000
WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV.....	1,018,000	1,018,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV.....	1,253,000	1,828,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV.....	1,167,000	1,167,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV.....	1,563,000	1,563,000
(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV.....	370,000	370,000
(FC)	ELKINS, WV.....	11,000	11,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV.....	93,000	93,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV.....	8,743,000	8,743,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV.....	1,418,000	1,418,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV.....	970,000	970,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV.....	1,612,000	1,612,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV.....	1,611,000	1,611,000
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV.....	1,243,000	1,243,000
WISCONSIN			
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI.....	910,000	910,000
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI.....	1,926,000	1,926,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI.....	1,048,000	1,048,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKE DISPOSAL).....	3,613,000	3,613,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI.....	15,000	15,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI.....	188,000	188,000
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI.....	93,000	93,000
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI.....	407,000	407,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI.....	1,779,000	1,779,000
(N)	PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI.....	175,000	175,000
(N)	PORT WING HARBOR, WI.....	222,000	222,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI.....	96,000	96,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI.....	511,000	511,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY HARBOR & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI....	324,000	324,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI.....	475,000	475,000
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI.....	199,000	199,000
	WYOMING		
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY.....	553,000	553,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY.....	315,000	315,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	4,000,000	2,500,000
	CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION).....	2,000,000	1,500,000
	DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM..	735,000	500,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)..	6,000,000	4,000,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM..	1,700,000	1,500,000
	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	2,930,000	2,500,000
	GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS.....	---	500,000
	HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION.....	600,000	600,000
	MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS.....	1,900,000	1,500,000
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	20,000	20,000
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP).....	5,500,000	5,500,000
	NATIONAL RESOURCES TECHNICAL SUPPORT (NRTS).....	900,000	700,000
	PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM.....	415,000	415,000
	PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)....	50,000	1,000,000
	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION...	675,000	500,000
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS.....	500,000	500,000
	REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINT & REHAB RESEARCH (REMR II)..	3,000,000	2,000,000
	WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM.....	850,000	650,000
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-29,368,000	-32,253,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....	1,618,000,000	1,740,025,000

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

The conference agreement appropriates \$41,153,000 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act as proposed by the House and the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs, and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

The conference agreement appropriates \$694,348,000 for Water and Related Resources instead of \$651,931,000 as proposed by the House and \$688,379,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$56,442,000 for the Central Arizona Project, \$4,796,000 below the budget request. The conferees direct that \$3,245,000 of the reduction be derived from native fish protection activities. The remainder of the reduction should be derived from noncontract costs.

The conference agreement includes \$4,700,000 for the Applied Science and Technology Development program. Within the amount provided, \$1,000,000 is for completion of the in-situ copper mining research project. In addition, \$300,000 has been provided for Bureau of Reclamation oversight of that program and for related technology transfer activities.

The conference agreement includes an additional \$1,500,000 for the completion of design and initiation of construction of the fish screen at the Contra Costa Canal intake at Rock Slough in California.

The conference agreement includes an additional \$3,000,000 for the Anadromous Fish Screen Program. Within funds available to the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, including funds appropriated in fiscal year 1997, the conferees direct the Bureau of Reclamation to fund the following fish screen projects at the levels indicated below: Reclamation District 108, \$5,000,000; Reclamation District 1004, \$2,625,000; and Princeton-Glenn-Codora and Provident Irrigation Districts, \$2,500,000.

The conference agreement includes \$6,000,000 for the Animas-La Plata project as proposed by the Senate. The conferees continue to support the Animas-La Plata project in Colorado and New Mexico, which is necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988. Controversy has delayed the construction of the project by the Bureau of Reclamation despite the commitments made in the Settlement Act and a subsequent directive by the Congress that those portions of the project which were approved under the Endangered Species Act should be constructed without delay. In the last year, the Governor of Colorado and the Secretary of the Interior have convened the project supporters and opponents in a process intended to seek resolution of the controversy. The Colorado process calls for a project proposal from parties to the settlement as well as one from those who oppose the project as presently contemplated. The conferees direct that funds previously appropriated for the project and still available are to be used for the project and advancement of a modified project from the process which meets the original intent of the Settlement to provide a new supply of water to meet the

present and future needs of the Ute Tribes and the surrounding region. In the event such a project is advanced, the Department of the Interior and other Federal agencies are directed to utilize to the fullest extent the existing environmental compliance documents.

The conferees direct the Bureau of Reclamation to notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate before reprogramming any funds from the Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project in Kansas. The conferees understand that the project is being cost shared on a 50-50 basis.

The conference agreement includes \$300,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to work with local interests to identify the most effective voluntary water conservation practices applicable to the Walker River Basin in Nevada, and to quantify the contribution that voluntary conservation can make to solving the water resources problems in Walker Lake and the basin as a whole.

The conference agreement includes \$400,000 for NEPA compliance and design activities associated with the Rio Grande Conveyance/Pipeline project in New Mexico and Texas.

The conferees are concerned with the impacts on recreation and resident fish populations resulting from the operating regimes at Hungry Horse and Grand Coulee Dams. The Northwest Power Planning Council has developed a regionally approved plan, known as the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, and the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, should consider the Council's program and operate the projects in a manner consistent with the program.

The conferees direct that of the \$500,000 provided for facility operation and maintenance on the Newlands Project in Nevada, that \$300,000 shall be applied to the costs of supplying water to the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge and to recovery of endangered fish in accordance with the Truckee-Carson Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act, Public Law 101-618, and the Truckee River Water Quality Agreement. Further, \$200,000 shall be used to assist the town of Fernley, Nevada, and the Pyramid Lake Tribe, on behalf of the town of Wadsworth in evaluating the joint municipal water source and delivery system, a wastewater conveyance source, and wastewater reclamation for the Fernley Wildlife Management Area.

The conference agreement includes \$5,759,000 for the Wetland Development Program. Within the amount recommended, the conferees have included \$1,450,000 under fish and wildlife management and development for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake Central Arizona Project fish and wildlife activities.

The conferees are in agreement with the language in the House report regarding operation and maintenance (O&M) costs, deficits, and budget development. With regard to water rate-setting policies, the conferees urge the Bureau of Reclamation to review and, where necessary, consider modification to these policies to ensure that current O&M water rates revenues are applied against O&M expenses with any deficiency resulting in an O&M deficit to the water contractor.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House regarding the Coolidge Dam, San Carlos Irrigation project in Arizona.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate providing \$500,000 for the installation of drains in the Pena Blanca area of New Mexico to prevent seepage from Cochiti Dam.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate providing that funds available for expenditure for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program may be expended for site remediation on a non-reimbursable basis.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate to increase the authorized level of appropriations for the municipal, rural, and industrial water systems for the Fort Berthold, Standing Rock, and Spirit Lake Nation in order to allow activities to continue. The Senate language has been amended to make technical corrections.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate providing \$80,000 to complete the feasibility study of alternatives for meeting the drinking water needs on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation and surrounding communities in South Dakota. Funding for this project is included in the amount appropriated for Water and Related Resources.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate providing that the Secretary of the Interior may use \$2,500,000 for the McCall Area Wastewater Reclamation and Reuse project in Idaho.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate providing \$300,000 for planning studies and other activities for the Ute Reservoir Pipeline (Quay County portion) in New Mexico. Funding for this project is included in the amount appropriated for Water and Related Resources.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate providing \$185,000 for a feasibility study of alternatives for the Crow Creek Rural Water Supply System to meet the drinking water needs on the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Reservation in South Dakota. Funding for this project is included in the amount appropriated for water and related resources.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The conference agreement appropriates \$10,425,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account as proposed by the House and Senate.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

The conference agreement appropriates \$33,130,000 for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$39,130,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement includes language which provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall levy additional mitigation and restoration payments totaling no more than \$25,130,000 (October 1992 price levels) on a three-year rolling average basis, as authorized by Section 3407(d) of Public Law 102-575.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

The conference agreement appropriates \$85,000,000 for the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration program instead of \$120,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement appropriates \$47,558,000 for Policy and Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$47,658,000 as proposed by the House.

SPECIAL FUNDS

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate regarding the Reclamation Fund and the special fund in the Treasury created by the Act of December 22, 1987. The Bureau of Reclamation has advised the conferees that this language is not required.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES					
ARIZONA					
	CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT (LCRBDF).....	61,242,000	---	56,442,000	---
	COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I.....	3,078,000	6,500,000	3,078,000	6,500,000
	COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM.....	4,200,000	---	4,200,000	---
	INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECT.....	---	8,317,000	---	8,317,000
	SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSE MESA DAM.....	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
	SOUTHERN ARIZONA REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT.....	6,693,000	---	6,693,000	---
	TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	---	---	250,000	---
	VERDE RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	WEST SALT RIVER VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	75,000	---	200,000	---
	YUMA AREA PROJECTS.....	1,670,000	11,868,000	1,670,000	13,368,000
CALIFORNIA					
	BRACKISH WATER RECLAMATION DEMONSTRATION FACILITY.....	---	---	2,000,000	---
	CACHUMA PROJECT.....	565,000	8,881,000	565,000	8,881,000
	CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
	AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION.....	2,219,000	16,204,000	10,819,000	16,204,000
	CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT ACT.....	4,362,000	---	4,362,000	---
	DELTA DIVISION.....	13,368,000	4,682,000	14,868,000	4,682,000
	EAST SIDE DIVISION.....	199,000	3,190,000	199,000	3,190,000
	FRIANT DIVISION.....	3,426,000	5,406,000	3,426,000	5,406,000
	MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	16,632,000	2,504,000	19,632,000	2,504,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	7,685,000	1,186,000	8,685,000	1,186,000
	SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	1,345,000	---	1,345,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION.....	6,955,000	---	6,955,000	---
	SHASTA DIVISION.....	6,619,000	4,929,000	6,619,000	4,929,000
	TRINITY RIVER DIVISION.....	5,643,000	4,220,000	5,643,000	4,220,000
	WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS.....	445,000	4,981,000	445,000	4,981,000
	WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT.....	2,839,000	9,833,000	2,839,000	12,833,000
	DEL NORTE & CRESCENT CITY WASTEWATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	---	---	550,000	---
	IMPERIAL VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	75,000	---	75,000	---
	LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE.....	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
	LOWER OWENS RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MAMMOTH LAKES WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	80,000	---	80,000	---
	NEW MELONES WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	---	---	100,000	---
	ORLAND PROJECT.....	431,000	45,000	431,000	45,000
	SACRAMENTO COUNTY WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY.....	---	---	500,000	---
	SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
	SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM.....	13,000,000	---	13,000,000	---
	SAN FRANCISCO AREA WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	375,000	---	375,000	---
	SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT.....	5,235,000	---	5,235,000	---
	SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE.....	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
	SOLANO PROJECT.....	1,624,000	208,000	1,624,000	208,000
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COASTAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	350,000	---	350,000	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
	SO. CALIF. COMPREHENSIVE WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	769,000	---	769,000	---
	COLORADO				
	ANIMAS-LAPLATA PROJECT, SECT. 5 & 8.....	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
	BOSTWICK PARK PROJECT.....	40,000	36,000	40,000	36,000
	COLLBRAN PROJECT.....	72,000	716,000	72,000	716,000
	COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT.....	115,000	6,539,000	115,000	6,539,000
	DALLAS CREEK PROJECT.....	18,000	134,000	18,000	134,000
	DOLORIS PROJECT.....	10,592,000	433,000	10,592,000	433,000
	FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT.....	46,000	3,864,000	46,000	3,864,000
	GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP.....	4,456,000	635,000	4,456,000	635,000
	LEADVILLE / ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT.....	770,000	798,000	770,000	798,000
	LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP.....	---	444,000	---	444,000
	MESA COUNTY WATER CONSERVATION STUDY.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
	PARADOX UNIT, CRBSCP.....	---	2,782,000	---	2,782,000
	SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN / CONEJOS.....	70,000	3,052,000	70,000	3,052,000
	UPPER COLORADO AREA PROJECTS.....	103,000	57,000	103,000	57,000
	IDAHO				
	BOISE AREA PROJECTS.....	2,577,000	2,421,000	2,577,000	2,421,000
	COLUMBIA-SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT.....	13,062,000	---	13,062,000	---
	IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
	MCCALL AREA WASTEWATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE.....	---	---	---	---
	MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS.....	3,728,000	1,742,000	3,728,000	1,742,000
	MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
	UPPER SALMON RIVER WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	175,000	---	175,000	---
	KANSAS				
	CHENEY RESERVOIR WATER QUALITY STUDY.....	131,000	---	131,000	---
	CHEYENNE BOTTOMS WILDLIFE AREA STUDY.....	101,000	---	101,000	---
	EQUUS BEDS GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.....	---	---	---	---
	WICHITA PROJECT.....	122,000	68,000	122,000	68,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
	MONTANA				
	COLD CLIMATE WASTEWATER TREATMENT.....	37,000	---	37,000	---
	FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION.....	---	---	240,000	---
	FORT PECK RURAL WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM.....	---	---	300,000	---
	HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT.....	---	408,000	---	408,000
	JEFFERSON RIVER BASIN RETURN FLOW STUDY.....	86,000	---	86,000	---
	MILK RIVER PROJECT.....	53,000	706,000	53,000	706,000
	MONTANA RIVER SYSTEMS STUDY.....	180,000	---	180,000	---
	PALLID STURGEON RECOVERY DECISION.....	65,000	---	65,000	---
	WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY.....	50,000	---	50,000	---
	YELLOWSTONE RIVER BASIN STUDY.....	75,000	---	75,000	---
	NEBRASKA				
	NEBRASKA RAINWATER BASIN ASSESSMENT.....	133,000	---	133,000	---
	NEBRASKA WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT.....	88,000	---	88,000	---
	NEVADA				
	LAS VEGAS SHALLOW AQUIFER DESALINATION DEMO.....	---	---	3,750,000	---
	NEWLANDS PROJECT.....	3,750,000	---	3,750,000	500,000
	WALKER RIVER BASIN.....	---	---	300,000	---
	WASHOE PROJECT.....	866,000	461,000	866,000	461,000
	NEW MEXICO				
	ALBUQUERQUE WASTEWATER RECYCLING.....	---	---	5,000,000	---
	BRANTLEY PROJECT.....	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
	CARLSBAD PROJECT.....	1,059,000	437,000	1,059,000	437,000
	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT.....	1,830,000	8,932,000	1,830,000	9,432,000
	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE WATER CONVEYANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	80,000	---	80,000	---
	PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT.....	---	129,000	---	129,000
	RIO GRANDE CONVEYANCE CANAL/PIPELINE.....	---	---	400,000	---
	RIO GRANDE PROJECT.....	537,000	2,475,000	537,000	2,475,000
	RIO GRANDE RIPARIAN TREE SPECIES CONSUMPTIVE USE.....	75,000	---	75,000	---
	SAN JUAN-CHAMA PROJECT.....	70,000	153,000	70,000	153,000
	SAN JUAN GALLUP-NAVAJO PIPELINE.....	---	---	450,000	---
	SANTE FE WATER REUSE.....	---	---	500,000	---
	UTE RESERVOIR PIPELINE.....	---	---	300,000	---
	VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
	FREEZE/THAW DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.....	360,000	---	360,000	---
	GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP.....	17,025,000	6,350,000	22,525,000	6,350,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
OKLAHOMA					
	ARBUCKLE PROJECT.....	39,000	55,000	39,000	55,000
	LUGERT-ALTUS WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MCREE CREEK PROJECT.....	162,000	383,000	162,000	383,000
	MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT.....	79,000	44,000	79,000	44,000
	NORMAN PROJECT.....	104,000	12,000	104,000	12,000
	OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	135,000	---	135,000	---
	WASHITA BASIN PROJECT.....	143,000	172,000	143,000	172,000
	W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT.....	70,000	85,000	70,000	85,000
OREGON					
	CENTRAL OREGON IRRIG. SYSTEM CONSERVATION FEASIBILITY.....	225,000	---	225,000	---
	CROOKED RIVER PROJECT.....	116,000	400,000	116,000	400,000
	DESCHUTES PROJECT.....	89,000	146,000	89,000	146,000
	GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	50,000	---	50,000	---
	KLAMATH PROJECT.....	2,405,000	370,000	2,405,000	370,000
	OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY.....	75,000	---	75,000	---
	OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING STUDY.....	175,000	---	175,000	---
	ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION.....	87,000	682,000	87,000	682,000
	SOUTHERN OREGON COASTAL RIVER BASINS STUDY.....	175,000	---	175,000	---
	TUALATIN PROJECT.....	13,000	111,000	13,000	111,000
	UMATILLA PROJECT.....	7,849,000	1,505,000	7,849,000	1,505,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
	BELLE FOURCHE, P-SMBP.....	---	2,520,000	---	2,520,000
	BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER STUDY.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX RESERVATION.....	---	---	80,000	---
	CROW CREEK RURAL WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM.....	---	---	185,000	---
	MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT.....	10,000,000	---	13,000,000	---
	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN TRIBES WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	208,000	---	208,000	---
	MNI WICONI PROJECT.....	20,976,000	3,349,000	27,976,000	3,349,000
	RAPID CITY WASTEWATER REUSE STUDY.....	75,000	---	75,000	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
TEXAS					
	CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT.....	25,000	55,000	25,000	55,000
	COLORADO RIVER PROJECT.....	2,000	7,000	2,000	7,000
	NUJECES RIVER PROJECT.....	127,000	195,000	127,000	195,000
	NORTHWEST WASTEWATER REUSE PROJECT.....	---	---	1,000,000	---
	PALMETTO BEND PROJECT.....	169,000	314,000	169,000	314,000
	RINCON BAYOU - NUJECES MARSH RESTORATION STUDY.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
	RIO GRANDE PROJECT DRAINS WATER QUALITY STUDY.....	95,000	---	95,000	---
	RIO GRANDE/RIO BRAVO INTERNATIONAL BASIN ASSESSMNT.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
	SAN ANGELO PROJECT.....	100,000	20,479,000	100,000	20,479,000
	SAN ANTONIO WATER RECYCLING PROGRAM.....	---	---	200,000	---
UTAH					
	ASHLEY/BRUSH CREEKS OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	130,000	---	130,000	---
	CARBON/EMERY COUNTIES WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	130,000	---	130,000	---
	CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE/JENSEN.....	3,921,000	44,000	3,921,000	44,000
	OGDEN RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	125,000	---	125,000	---
	PROVO RIVER PROJECT.....	235,000	217,000	235,000	217,000
	TOOELE WASTEWATER TREATMENT & REUSE.....	---	---	500,000	---
	WEBER BASIN PROJECT.....	373,000	1,538,000	373,000	1,538,000
WASHINGTON					
	COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT.....	4,239,000	6,099,000	4,239,000	6,099,000
	WASHINGTON RIVER BASIN PLANNING.....	175,000	---	175,000	---
	YAKIMA PROJECT.....	8,980,000	8,839,000	9,980,000	8,839,000
WYOMING					
	KENDRICK PROJECT.....	107,000	2,547,000	107,000	2,547,000
	NORTH PLATTE PROJECT.....	93,000	1,137,000	93,000	1,137,000
	SHOSHONE PROJECT.....	80,000	1,152,000	80,000	1,152,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
	VARIOUS				
	COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, T. II BASINWIDE	7,600,000	---	7,600,000	---
	COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECT. 8, REC. FISH & WILDLIFE.	2,284,000	---	2,284,000	---
	COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.....	310,000	---	310,000	---
	DEPARTMENT IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM.....	3,553,000	---	3,109,000	---
	EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM.....	5,250,000	---	3,000,000	---
	ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION.....	14,257,000	---	14,257,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.....	1,990,000	---	1,990,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL/INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES.....	1,665,000	---	1,338,000	---
	EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES.....	---	2,142,000	---	2,142,000
	GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	1,730,000	---	1,730,000	---
	INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
	LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	7,602,000	---	7,602,000	---
	MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
	MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS.....	105,000	766,000	105,000	766,000
	NATIONAL FISH & WILDLIFE FOUNDATION.....	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
	NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS.....	8,459,000	---	8,000,000	---
	NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING.....	662,000	---	662,000	---
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.....	107,000	215,000	107,000	215,000
	PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN - OTHER PROJECTS.....	3,648,000	16,376,000	3,648,000	16,376,000
	POWER PROGRAM SERVICES.....	622,000	1,050,000	622,000	1,050,000
	PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM.....	394,000	66,000	394,000	66,000
	RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION.....	4,996,000	---	4,800,000	---
	RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT - TITLE 28.....	4,288,000	---	3,000,000	---
	RECREATION AND FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.....	4,922,000	---	3,261,000	---
	SAFETY OF DAMS:				
	DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
	SAFETY OF DAMS EVALUATION & MODIFICATION.....	---	42,433,000	---	42,433,000
	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
	APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	3,850,000	---	4,700,000	---
	DESALINATION RESEARCH DEV PROGRAM.....	2,000,000	---	3,700,000	---
	GROUNDWATER RECHARGE.....	199,000	---	199,000	---
	IMPROVED RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT CONTROL.....	400,000	---	---	---
	TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT.....	400,000	---	300,000	---
	WATERSHED / RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	SITE SECURITY.....	---	5,000,000	---	5,000,000
	SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION.....	239,000	---	239,000	---
	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	1,700,000	---	1,500,000	---
	WATER MANAGEMENT CONSERVATION PROGRAM.....	9,801,000	---	9,235,000	---
	WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT.....	6,309,000	---	5,759,000	---
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	-30,953,000	---	-33,463,000
	TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES.....	421,874,000	229,678,000	461,680,000	232,668,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
	LOAN PROGRAM				
	CALIFORNIA				
	CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER.....	2,100,000	---	2,100,000	---
	CHINO BASIN DESALINATION.....	1,718,000	---	1,718,000	---
	SALINAS VALLEY.....	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
	SAN SEVAINÉ PROJECT.....	976,000	---	976,000	---
	TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT.....	651,000	---	651,000	---
	OREGON				
	MILLTOWN HILL, DOUGLAS COUNTY.....	3,255,000	---	3,255,000	---
	VARIOUS				
	LOAN ADMINISTRATION.....	425,000	---	425,000	---
	TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....	10,425,000	---	10,425,000	---

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs, and activities of the Department of Energy. Additional items of conference agreements are discussed below.

REPROGRAMMING

The conference agreement does not provide the Department of Energy with any internal reprogramming flexibility in fiscal year 1998 unless specifically identified in the House, Senate, or conference reports. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in advance in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees.

EXTERNAL REGULATION OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FACILITIES

The conference agreement directs that all new nuclear facilities for which construction starts in the year 2000 or beyond are to be constructed in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) licensing standards. The Department is directed to consult with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations should implementation of this policy pose critical national security concerns with respect to any particular nuclear facility.

SUPPORT SERVICE CONTRACTS

The conferees agree with the House report language which directs the Department to prepare a report on the use of support service contractors and the use of management and operating contractor and subcontractor employees detailed to Headquarters. This report is due on January 30, 1998. The Department should consult with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the level of detail required in this report.

The conferees continue to be concerned about the Department's inappropriate use of support service contractors. The Department continues to pay contractors to perform day to day functions that should be performed by Federal employees. There is a clear distinction between administrative support and technical assistance. Support service contractors can play an important and cost-effective role in supplying special technical expertise unavailable within the Department. However, the conferees believe there has been a distinct lack of responsible management of these contractors. Therefore, the Department is directed to develop a plan to provide more effective management of support service contractors without increasing the number of Federal employees. This plan is to be submitted to Congress at the time of the fiscal year 1999 budget submission. The Department is directed to reduce the number of support service contractors providing administrative support and performing inherently governmental functions. Remaining support service contractors should include only those providing specific technical assistance with a well-defined product or service as the deliverable and an established completion date for the product or service. These technical assistance contracts must meet the Congressional intent of full and open competition, fixed price contracts, and performance-based management.

GENERAL REDUCTIONS NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE SPECIFIC PROGRAM DIRECTIONS

In the event that specific program guidance contained in the House, Senate, or conference reports requires a general reduction of available funding, such reductions shall not be applied disproportionately against any program, project, or activity.

ENERGY SUPPLY

The conference agreement includes \$906,807,000, instead of \$880,730,000 as proposed

by the House and \$966,940,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement does not include bill language extending the availability of funds in this account beyond fiscal year 1998.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

The conference agreement includes \$346,266,000, which includes \$301,962,000 for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and \$44,304,000 representing research done by the Office of Energy Research. This action follows the direction provided by the House to put research back into research and development. The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and the Office of Energy Research are directed to work together to ensure that the Department's solar and renewable research and development budget reflects the cooperation of the two Offices. The Department is directed to submit its fiscal year 1999 solar and renewable energy budget comprehensively, as it is displayed in the table in this conference report.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—From the amount provided, \$1,500,000 shall be directed to university research to increase university participation in this program and to fund the acquisition of photovoltaic test equipment at the participating institutions. Furthermore, while developing its FY 1999 budget request, the Department is encouraged to consider the funding needs of university photovoltaic programs.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The conference agreement does not include the Senate prohibition on funding to deploy additional dish/engine systems.

Biomass/biofuels.—The conference agreement includes \$98,385,000, which includes \$38,635,000 for research done by the Office of Energy Research. The conferees direct that the funds be allocated in the following manner: Within "Power systems"—\$1,500,000 for thermal conversion, \$23,000,000 for system development, \$3,000,000 for biomass cogeneration, and \$750,000 for the Gridley rice straw project; and, within "Biofuels"—\$27,000,000 for ethanol production, including \$4,000,000 for the biomass ethanol plant in Jennings, Louisiana, and \$2,500,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research. The Department is directed to provide \$3,500,000 for feedstock development and \$2,000,000 for the regional biomass program each to be equally derived from the power systems and biofuels programs.

Wind.—The conference agreement does not include the House prohibition on funding for incremental product improvement partnerships with manufacturers.

International solar energy.—The conference agreement includes \$1,375,000, an increase of \$625,000 over the amount provided by the House. The conferees direct that the funding be provided for the U.S. initiative on joint implementation as provided in the Senate report.

Hydrogen.—The conference agreement does not include House language urging the Department to avoid commitments to multi-million dollar demonstration projects. The conference agreement includes \$3,000,000 for the Russian-American Fuel Cell Consortium, \$1,000,000 less than the amount provided by the Senate.

Renewable Indian energy resources.—The conference agreement includes \$4,000,000, the amount provided by the Senate, which includes: \$2,000,000, the same amount as the current year, for the Power Creek Hydroelectric Project in Cordova, Alaska; \$800,000 for the Old Harbor Hydroelectric Project in the Village of Old Harbor, Alaska; \$1,000,000 for the Upper Lynn Canal Regional Electric Project in Skagway Bay, Alaska; and \$100,000 to complete studies and confirm the feasibility of several small hydroelectric facilities in the Village of Scammon Bay, Alaska.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The conference agreement includes up to \$1,000,000 for a research and development partnership to manufacture electric transmission lines using aluminum matrix composite materials.

Federal buildings/Remote power initiatives.—The House and Senate each included proposals intended to direct the Department to identify and pursue near term opportunities to exploit the strengths of solar and renewable energy technologies. The conference agreement includes both initiatives and provides \$5,000,000 for these activities. The Department is directed to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with a program plan which includes a funding profile, and criteria for awarding proposals. All proposals must include a cost benefit analysis. The Department may approve only proposals that have verifiable, favorable cost benefits over a period of not more than ten years. Cost benefits shall be based exclusively on actual monetary costs and savings.

Program direction.—The conference agreement includes \$15,651,000 for program direction. The conferees have provided additional funds to address the issues raised in the House report with regard to program taxes. In short, the Department has reallocated program funds to pay for support service contractors, equipment, travel, "cross-cutting" activities, "Assistant Secretary initiatives" and other activities not described in the budget request. All funding for support service contracts and the aforementioned activities is provided in program direction. The Department is directed to end its practice of taxing programs and to allocate funding to programs in accordance with allocations stipulated in appropriations bills.

Excessive carryover balances.—The conferees strongly endorse the concerns expressed in the House report and direct that the Department allocate the prior year balance adjustment to programs with consideration given to which programs have available carryover funds. The conferees direct that the Department allocate new budget authority for solar and renewable programs after making an adjustment which reflects a careful analysis of each program's share of carryover balances.

Executive Order 12902.—The conference agreement includes the Senate recommendation that the assessment and report be done by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

NUCLEAR ENERGY

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The recommendation is \$7,000,000, a \$3,000,000 increase over the current fiscal year. The Department is directed to include appropriate laboratories, industry groups and universities in this program. The conference agreement provides \$2,200,000 for the core university reactor fuel program and another \$2,200,000 for the peer-reviewed Nuclear Engineering Education Research (NEER) program. None of the funds are to be provided to industry and no less than \$5,000,000 is to be made available to universities participating in this program.

Termination costs.—The conference agreement includes \$77,035,000, including a total of \$33,000,000 for electrometallurgical-related activities. An additional \$12,000,000 is provided for nuclear technology research and development in Other Defense Activities. The conference agreement does not include the Senate recommendation to provide \$3,000,000 for the advanced light water reactor program. The conference agreement includes the Senate reduction to the budget request, \$1,500,000, for management studies and evaluations.

Isotope support.—The conference agreement recommendation for isotope support shall include funds for isotope production and distribution including alpha-emitter production, chemistry research and preclinical studies.

Program direction.—The conference agreement combines the separate program direction lines in the uranium, isotope support and other nuclear energy programs. The amount provided, \$21,000,000, is \$5,110,000 more than the amount provided by the House and \$3,066,000 less than the comparable amount in the budget request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The conference agreement includes \$66,050,000, of which \$23,550,000 is provided for program direction. The conferees have provided a more balanced distribution of the program direction funding by providing an additional \$20,000,000 in the defense environment, safety and health program.

MAGNETIC FUSION ENERGY

The conferees have adopted the Senate title for this program. The conference agreement provides \$232,000,000 which includes \$2,000,000 for fusion irradiation activities currently funded under the domestic nuclear energy program.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The conference agreement includes a \$31,535,000 adjustment reflecting availability of prior year balances, an increase of \$13,000,000 to the adjustment recommended by the House. The Department is directed to evaluate availability of prior year balances and allocate this reduction based on that evaluation.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The conference agreement appropriates \$497,059,000 instead of \$497,619,000 as proposed by the House and \$664,684,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to transfer the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) to the Corps of Engineers, and funding for this program is contained in Title I of the bill.

The conferees direct the Department of Energy to assess the cost of decommissioning the Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor site in Arkansas and provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations by September 30, 1998. The conferees further acknowledge the purpose of the Integrated Petroleum Environmental Consortium, but do not believe this initiative properly falls within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittees.

The conference agreement funds the University Research Program in Robotics at a level of \$4,000,000 in the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account.

The conferees are aware that Advanced Nuclear & Medical Systems Inc. (ANMS) which had been the principal proponent for delaying the deactivation and decommissioning of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) at Richland, Washington, has withdrawn its proposal to convert the FFTF for tritium and medical isotope production. On the basis of the original proposal, the Department has delayed until December 1998 a decision to shut down the reactor, increasing the costs to the government of maintaining the reactor in a standby condition. The conferees direct the Department to make a determination on the continued standby status of the FFTF as part of the fiscal year 1999 budget submission.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

The conference agreement appropriates \$220,200,000 as proposed by the House instead

of \$230,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement retains bill language proposed by the House providing funds for the uranium and thorium reimbursement program, and increases the funding level of \$40,000,000. The conferees agree with the House proposed reporting requirements.

SCIENCE

The conference agreement includes \$2,235,708,000, \$28,076,000 more than House and \$12,631,000 more than the comparable Senate amount.

High energy physics.—The conference agreement provides \$680,035,000 for high energy physics. This is the amount provided by the House and represents a \$5,000,000 increase over the amount requested by the Administration.

Nuclear physics.—The conference agreement provides \$320,925,000 for nuclear physics. This is the amount provided by the House and represents a \$5,000,000 increase over the amount requested by the Administration.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The conferees support the peer-reviewed nuclear medicine research program in biological imaging at the University of California Los Angeles and strongly encourage the Department to fully fund that research in fiscal year 1998.

The Department of Energy will initiate and carry out a rigorous, peer-reviewed research program that will apply the molecular level knowledge gained from the Department's human genome and structural biology research to ascertain the effects on levels ranging from cells to whole organisms that arise from low-dose-rate exposures to energy and defense-related insults (such as radiation and chemicals). By providing a scientific basis for determining the effects of low-dose exposure, this program will lead to reductions in the uncertainties inherent in current calculations and the development of new, more reliable risk management methods. The ultimate goal is adequate, cost effective health protection for workers and the public from radiation, chemicals and waste clean-up that is commensurate with actual risks.

The conferees have included \$3,000,000 for this effort in fiscal year 1998 and direct the Department to develop a multi-year program plan, including budgets, for the subsequent ten years.

The conference agreement includes \$4,000,000 to upgrade a nuclear radiation center to accommodate boron neutron capture therapy (BNCT) research in conjunction with the University of California—Davis. BNCT is the selective irradiation of tissue for treatment of inoperable brain tumors. The conference agreement also includes \$7,500,000 for design, planning and construction of an expansion of the Medical University of South Carolina's cancer research center. This addition will provide research and treatment areas for the utilization of Positron Emission Tomography, using metabolic biomarkers, a ribozyme-based gene therapy. The conferees are aware of the high rate of cancer nationwide, the need to translate basic biomarker research to direct application, and the need for expansion of this facility. The conferees have provided \$3,000,000 to develop proton scanning technology. This effort utilizes the existing proton therapy capabilities at the Proton Cancer Treatment Center at Loma Linda Medical Center in California in cooperation with the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory. This effort will expand the use of this superior radiation treatment, enabling more precise, safe, and effective treatment of breast, lung and other cancers, without disabling side effects. The conference agreement also includes \$3,000,000 for

cancer treatment efforts included in the Medical Research Initiative at the University of Rochester Medical Center.

The conference agreement includes \$2,000,000 for Englewood Hospital in New Jersey which employs a condensed diagnosis process in its breast cancer treatment program. The conference agreement also includes \$10,000,000 for the Northeast Regional Cancer Institute for innovative research that supports the Department's exploration of microbial genetics. The Department will benefit from the Institute's unique assets to pursue medical research related to the Human Genome Project. Also, recent breakthrough findings indicate that there is a third form of life, the Archaea, whose unique properties allow them to flourish under extreme conditions. Understanding the genetic basis of these properties promises to lead to diverse applications and public benefit. The Department has played an early and leading role in supporting this research. This new collaboration will expand the Department's exploration of the science and applications of these results for its energy, environmental, and health effects missions. The conference agreement also includes \$2,500,000 for design, planning and construction of a science and engineering center at Highlands University in Las Vegas, New Mexico.

Human Genome Project.—The conference agreement does not include House language opposing the increase proposed in the budget request to evaluate ethical, legal and social implications of genome research.

National Institute for Global and Environmental Change (NIGEC).—The conference agreement includes \$8,200,000, the amount provided in the budget request.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR).—The conference agreement includes \$7,000,000, the amount provided in the budget request.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH

Computational and technology research.—The conference agreement does not include House language regarding the transfer of funds to the fusion program, nor the Senate language regarding computer equipment for the Institute for Computational Chemistry and Molecular Modeling.

University and Science Education.—The conference agreement does not include the Senate proposal to provide \$10,000,000 for this program.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

The conference agreement appropriates \$160,000,000 as proposed by both the House and the Senate, including \$4,000,000 to be made available to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for multi-purpose canister licensing, as proposed by the Senate. The agreement includes no funding for the State of Nevada as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The agreement includes \$5,000,000 for affected units of local government instead of \$0 as proposed by the House and \$6,175,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The agreement includes a reduction of \$11,950,000 from the science program and a reduction of \$16,000,000 for personnel costs, training and travel expenses for Federal employees, support service contractors, non-safety related training for contractor employees, cooperative agreements and other programs not directly associated with the performance of characterization and interim storage activities.

The conferees fully expect the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management to achieve its Strategic Alignment Initiative targets for fiscal year 1998.

The conferees recognize the capability and availability of resources at the University of

Nevada-Las Vegas to store data and scientific studies related to Yucca Mountain and encourage the Department to maximize utilization of this resource.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement appropriates \$218,747,000 for Departmental Administration instead of \$214,723,000 as proposed by the House and \$220,847,000 as proposed by the Senate. Revenues of \$131,330,000 are estimated to be received in fiscal year 1998, resulting in a net appropriation of \$87,417,000.

The conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate providing additional amounts for cost of work for others provided that such increases are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount.

The conference agreement directs the Department to reduce staffing through buyouts and attrition to the level which can be appropriately supported within the available funds provided for fiscal year 1998. No direction to the Department to reduce specific organizations has been provided, but the conferees expect the Department to assess objectively the workload and value added by many of these support and administrative organizations and the redundancy existing with program organizations which have their own support staffs. Staffing reductions are not to be prorated across every organization.

Of the amount provided for other expenses within Departmental Administration, \$1,623,000 is available for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Secretary to pay the salaries and expenses of employees otherwise on detail to the Office of the Secretary.

The conferees have provided \$6,000,000 for a corporate management information system. The Department is directed to provide detailed information on the systems to be acquired, project costs and milestones, and a description of how these new systems will consolidate, eliminate, or integrate with all of the Department's current information systems. This detailed analysis is to be provided as part of the fiscal year 1999 budget submission.

The conference agreement provides reprogramming authority of \$1,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, within the Departmental Administration account. This should provide the needed flexibility to manage this account. Congressional notification of the use of this authority is to be provided on a quarterly basis.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement includes \$27,500,000, as proposed by both the House and Senate.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement appropriates \$4,146,692,000 instead of \$3,943,442,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,302,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate providing that funds are available until expended, and that funding for any ballistic missile defense program undertaken by the Department of Energy for the Department of Defense must be provided in accordance with procedures established for Work for Others by the Department of Energy.

Stockpile stewardship.—The conference agreement supports increased funding for many activities in the core stockpile stewardship program with the following specific adjustments. An additional \$45,000,000 has been provided for the core research and advanced technology program and enhanced non-nuclear component assessment and experimental activities. As directed by the Senate, \$15,000,000 is provided to develop an

in-house, contingent source of radiation hardened microelectronics. An increase of \$20,000,000 over the budget request is provided for the accelerated strategic computing initiative for a total of \$224,800,000. An appropriation of \$177,002,000, an increase of \$20,000,000 over the request, is provided to maintain a readiness capability to conduct an underground nuclear test at the Nevada test site. An additional \$30,000,000 is provided for infrastructure and equipment needs at the national laboratories and the Nevada test site.

The conferees understand that the Department has unique capabilities to assist the Department of Defense in its mission of land mine remediation. The conferees urge the Department to develop a proposal for a Work for Others program with the Department of Defense that would involve testing and demonstration of DOE land mine detection technology at the Nevada Test Site.

The conferees are aware of the significant scientific and technological advances made in the pulsed power program over the past year on the Z-accelerator at Sandia National Laboratory. The Department should support continued Z-physics experiments and improved diagnostic capabilities in the coming year.

Within the technology transfer program, \$10,000,000 is provided for the American Textile Partnership (AMTEX). No funds are provided for the Partnership for Next Generation Vehicles.

The conference agreement does not provide additional funding for the inertial confinement fusion program, but expects the Department to allocate existing funds to fully exploit the capabilities of the Nike, Omega, and Nova lasers.

Stockpile management.—For core stockpile management, the conference agreement provides \$2,052,150,000, which includes the following adjustments to the budget request. An additional \$35,000,000 is provided in support of the W87 program and to provide capability at the Y-12 plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in preparation for expected stockpile life extension program, \$7,500,000 is provided for enhanced surveillance activities, and \$35,000,000 is provided for manufacturing and infrastructure initiatives. Joint development of manufacturing technologies with laboratories is increased by \$5,000,000, and \$7,500,000 is provided for the Department's environmental surety program. An additional \$10,000,000 is recommended to sustain the modernization of the weapons complex begun last year; and an additional \$8,000,000 is included to continue upgrades to the existing tritium recycling facility.

Within the budget request for stockpile management, the Department included \$45,200,000 for safeguards and security activities at the Rocky Flats, Colorado, and Fernald, Ohio, environmental cleanup sites. The conference agreement transfers that funding to the Defense Facilities Closure Projects account.

The conferees have not provided funding for improvements to Greenville Road in Livermore, California. The City of Livermore has sought for several years to have funds appropriated in this bill for highway construction. The conferees are reluctant to proceed down the path of funding highways at every Department of Energy facility and urge the City to seek funding from more appropriate sources.

Program direction.—For program direction funding, the conference agreement provides \$250,000,000, a reduction of \$53,500,000 from the budget request. The Department anticipates carrying unobligated funds into fiscal year 1998 which will supplement this appropriation. The reduction is imposed in part because of the conferees' frustration that the

program has been unable to reduce its employee levels to those established by the Department's own Strategic Alignment Initiative. The Department is directed to meet the Strategic Alignment Initiative personnel ceilings which have been established for the defense programs organization in fiscal year 1998, and to impose the reduction in a manner that results in the implementation of the recommendations made by the Institute for Defense Analysis in its 120 day review of the program's management structure.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

The conference agreement appropriates \$4,429,438,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management instead of \$5,263,270,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,654,974,000 as proposed by the Senate. Additional funding of \$890,800,000 is contained in the Defense Facilities Closure Projects account and \$200,000,000 for Environmental Management Privatization, for a total of \$5,520,238,000 provided for all defense environmental management activities.

The conference agreement deletes language included by the Senate earmarking funds for closure projects. The conference agreement includes the Senate language providing that funds are available until expended.

Environmental restoration.—The conference agreement provides \$1,010,973,000 for environmental restoration, which is the budget request for all sites with only two exceptions. The conference agreement moves funding of \$743,600,000, the budget request included in environmental restoration for the Rocky Flats and Fernald sites, from this program to a new appropriation account, Defense Facilities Closure Projects.

An additional \$10,000,000 has been included in the environmental restoration program to accelerate cleanup at those sites or facilities which can effectively reduce outyear mortgage costs with small incremental funding increases. The conferees view the acceleration of cleanup of the Hanford 100 area as a prime example of a project that should continue to receive support. A small increase in funds provided in fiscal year 1998 could expedite the cleanup of reactors along the Columbia River in Hanford's 100 area and significantly reduce the outyear mortgages.

Waste management.—The conference agreement includes the funding level of \$1,571,644,000 proposed by the Senate for the waste management program, an increase of \$35,000,000 over the budget request. The additional funding should be used to continue critical ongoing activities at the Defense Waste Processing Facility in South Carolina, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, and the Hanford tank farm in Washington. The conferees have included in the funds otherwise available for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, \$1,748,000, the same as the current year, for the Environmental Evaluation Group.

Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization.—The conference agreement includes \$1,256,821,000 for nuclear materials and facilities stabilization. The recommendation includes an additional \$43,000,000 over the budget request for operation of facilities at the Savannah River Site to accelerate stabilization of "at risk" spent nuclear fuel currently stored at the site. The conferees agree with the House language on the need for a status report on these activities and direct that it be submitted by November 15, 1997. The conference agreement also provides an additional \$15,000,000 for the National Spent Fuel Program.

At the request of the Department, the conference agreement consolidates two prior year construction projects at the Savannah

River Site, the Health Physics Site Support Facility and the Environmental Monitoring Laboratory.

Technology development.—The conference agreement provides \$220,000,000 for the technology development program. As proposed by the House, \$4,000,000 is provided for the University Research Program in Robotics. Funding of \$5,000,000 is provided for the domestic and international technology systems applications programs, and the budget request of \$40,066,000 is provided to support the private industry programs.

The conference agreement provides \$27,000,000 to support the Department's efforts to deploy cost-effective new technologies. Deployment of new technologies is a strategic activity affecting virtually all environmental management programs and sites, and should be strongly supported as a complex-wide program, not another initiative established and maintained in isolation in the technology development organization.

The conferees acknowledge the work done by the Department's Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) in reviewing these deployment proposals, and would like to focus the panel on efforts to change records of decision which hamper the consideration and implementation of new technologies which may be faster and more cost effective than traditional cleanup remedies.

Six months after enactment of this Act and semi-annually thereafter, the Department is to provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations on the technologies under development within the program. The report should provide a description of each technology and its applications, an accounting of the Department's investment to date in the technology, and an anticipated return on investment.

The conferees note that technologies developed under this program will be of little or no value to the Department unless they are incorporated into the Department's environmental management records of decision. Regardless of the Department's tendency toward "stove-pipe" organizational arrangements, the Assistant Secretary of Environmental Management is to ensure that the Department's contractors are made aware of and utilize technologies developed by this program.

The conference report accompanying the fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act included a recommendation that the Department continue technology development on alternatives that might achieve satisfactory cleanup results at a significantly lower cost. The conferees believe that it would be prudent for the Department to maintain a research and development program that focuses on higher risk, high-payoff processing and vitrification technologies in parallel with ongoing efforts that could serve as a backup in the event conditions change. The conferees reaffirm the recommendation stated last year and strongly urge the Department to undertake a joint, cooperative effort between the Offices of Waste Management and Technology Development to assess the effectiveness and technical feasibility of the modular in-can and in-tank vitrification technology consistent with the fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Development Appropriations conference agreement.

The conferees urge the Department to support a joint, cooperative effort between the Offices of Technology Development, Environmental Restoration, Waste Management, and Nuclear Materials and Facilities Stabilization to develop a program to accelerate cleanup of lands which can be transferred to the public sector for other uses. Technology demonstrations should be directed to contaminated Department of Energy sites dem-

onstrating the capability of applying integration of technologies to recover useful lands for transfer to the public sector. These demonstrations should be in diverse regions of the country with the emphasis on a return on investment (ROI) analysis with firm schedules and cost analyses that support the ROI analysis. The lands should be determined by the ability to transfer them to the private sector in three to five years. The changes required to regulations, based on expected reductions of risk, increased public safety, and financial benefit to the government must be a specific end product of this demonstration. Reports on progress of these programs should be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for information on an annual basis with emphasis on completion of specific land restoration in three years.

Environmental science program.—The conferees are pleased with the progress to date in implementing the environmental basic research science program, and have provided \$55,000,000 for this activity in fiscal year 1998, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request. From these funds, \$48,000,000 has been provided for the basic science program, and \$7,000,000 for risk policy. Of the risk policy funding, \$4,000,000 is provided for the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP).

The conferees agree that the Department is to provide to the Committees on Appropriations a list of each research grant that has been funded, a description of what cleanup problem is to be addressed, and how the grantee is to interact with the Department and field sites to address the specific problems.

Privatization.—The conference agreement provides \$200,000,000 for the environmental privatization program to guarantee the Federal government's commitment to a variety of projects for which private financing will be sought by the contractors involved in bidding on these activities at Department of Energy sites. This funding is to be allocated consistent with the direction provided in the Fiscal Year 1998 National Security Authorization Act. An additional \$32,100,000 for the two privatization projects proposed for Fernald, Ohio, has been provided in the Defense Facilities Closure Projects account.

The conferees support statements in the Senate committee report on the importance of the tank waste remediation system (TWRS) privatization project. TWRS is an absolutely essential cleanup priority for the Hanford site. The conferees further believe that the funds provided by the conference agreement are sufficient for TWRS to proceed on schedule. Combined with last year's appropriation, the total budget authority provided by Congress for TWRS underscores the commitment to see this project completed.

The conferees also recognize the importance of meeting cleanup milestones at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in the court-ordered settlement agreement between the Department and the State of Idaho. Adequate funds should be provided for this purpose.

Program direction.—The conferees have provided \$345,000,000 for the program direction account. The Department will carry unobligated balances into fiscal year 1998 which will increase the funding available in this account.

Economic development.—The conference agreement maintains the current policy that no cleanup funds are to be used for economic development activities. The conferees have provided \$61,159,000 in the worker and community transition program which was established and authorized to fund such activities, and expect all economic development activities to be funded from that program.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

The conference agreement appropriates \$890,800,000 for the Defense Facilities Closure Projects account instead of \$905,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$65,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Department requested \$15,000,000 for closure projects as part of the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account. The conference agreement has established a separate appropriation account for closure projects to provide maximum visibility and accountability for program activities.

Last year the conferees expressed significant interest in accelerating closure of environmental management sites and urged the Department to provide adequate funds to support this effort at sites which could be cleaned up within ten years with a notable reduction in mortgage costs due to the accelerated schedule. The Administration's fiscal year 1998 budget request did not implement this direction. The conferees consider this a very important issue, and have established a separate appropriation account to fund those Department of Energy sites which have an established cost, schedule, and project plan which permits closure of the entire site by 2006. At this time, the conferees are aware of only two sites which meet this criteria: Rocky Flats, Colorado, and Fernald, Ohio. The Department is urged to develop firm cost, schedule, and technical plans for other sites such as Mound and the RMI Ashtabula project in Ohio which can be closed by 2006, and include those sites in this account in the fiscal year 1999 budget request.

The conferees are aware that portions of other sites which will continue to have a Department of Energy presence beyond 2006 are also candidates for accelerated cleanup activities. To accommodate those sites such as Savannah River, Hanford, and Oak Ridge, the conferees have provided additional funding in the defense environmental restoration program to accelerate cleanup activities. Sites with a continued Federal presence beyond 2006 are not candidates for the closure projects account.

The conferees are pleased that the Department now supports a 2006 closure date for the Rocky Flats site in Colorado. With a relatively small increase in funding over the budget request in fiscal year 1998, it is anticipated that total project costs of \$1,000,000,000 can be saved. The Department's budget included \$598,850,000 for Rocky Flats in various program accounts including \$44,000,000 funded in the Weapons Activity account for safeguards activities. The conference agreement consolidates all of this funding and provides an additional \$33,250,000 for a total of \$632,100,000 for cleanup activities.

Current cost projections indicate that closing the Fernald, Ohio, site by 2006 would cost approximately \$2,500,000,000, while closing it by 2011 increases costs to approximately \$2,800,000,000. The conferees' recommendation of \$258,700,000 provides the budget request from the environmental restoration program, \$1,200,000 for safeguards from the Weapons Activities appropriations, \$25,200,000 for the Waste Pits Remedial Action project, and \$6,900,000 for the Silo 3 Residue Waste Treatment project.

As part of the fiscal year 1999 budget submittal, the Department is directed to provide adequate detail showing the cost, scope, schedule, and technical assumptions which support these project closures by 2006. The Department is directed to ensure that the budget justifications provide adequate detail to permit Congress to track closure progress on an annual basis.

The current management and organization structure in the Environmental Management

program at the Department does not lend itself to the successful management of dynamic projects with established completion dates and fixed price costs. Federal management of such projects requires skills quite different from the level of effort activities often performed at DOE sites. The Department is directed to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 60 days of enactment of this bill with a detailed plan outlining a proposed project management structure which reduces the numerous layers of Federal bureaucracy through which closure projects must report.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement includes the Senate language providing that funds are available until expended.

The conference agreement appropriates \$1,666,008,000 for Other Defense Activities instead of \$1,580,504,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,637,981,000 as proposed by the Senate. Details of the conference agreement are provided below.

NONPROLIFERATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The conference agreement provides \$658,300,000 for nonproliferation and national security instead of \$586,700,000 as proposed by the House and \$662,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Within the funding for arms control, a total of \$29,600,000 is provided for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP). The House language requiring a separate report on the IPP program is eliminated. However, the conferees expect the Department to ensure that these funds are used only for activities directly related to preventing the exodus of nuclear weapons scientists from the former Soviet Union.

From within available funds for arms control, the conference agreement provides \$10,000,000 for nuclear material security at a site in Kazakhstan.

The conference agreement provides \$30,000,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 over the budget request, for the Department's security investigations program. The conferees are aware that the Department's budget request was not sufficient to support the necessary number of security clearances required in fiscal year 1998.

The conference agreement provides \$82,900,000 for the program direction account. The conferees direct the Department to meet the Strategic Alignment Initiative personnel ceilings which have been established for the nonproliferation and national security organization in fiscal year 1998 and beyond.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The conference agreement provides \$94,000,000, an increase of \$40,000,000 over the budget request, for defense-related environment, safety and health activities. The recommendation provides the Senate funding level for programmatic activities, and \$20,000,000 for the program direction account. Included in the recommendation is \$2,000,000 for the final year of the Hanford thyroid study.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The conference agreement provides \$61,159,000 for the worker and community transition program instead of \$56,000,000 as provided by the House and \$62,000,000 as provided by the Senate. The conferees direct that no other Departmental funds be used to provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits under the provisions of Section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, and that the Department provide a report by March 30, 1998, regarding the future need and justification for the program.

The conferees direct that none of the funds provided for this program be used for addi-

tional severance payments and benefits for Federal employees of the Department of Energy. Federal employees are covered by a multitude of laws which control employee benefits and protections during the downsizing of Federal agencies.

The Department submitted a budget amendment to establish an asset management pilot projects program within DOE and to sell or lease five specific assets. The conferees support this initiative, but funding considerations will not permit DOE to retain the net proceeds from the sales or leases. The Department is urged to proceed with implementation of the asset sales program under the current guidelines which permit the Department to retain proceeds from the sales and leases to the extent they are needed to cover the administrative costs of executing the sale or lease. The conferees are aware of the proposal for the national pilot program for electronics recovery and recycling, and have provided \$3,500,000 to initiate this program.

The conferees recognize the reductions in the defense work force at the Nevada Test Site as a consequence of defense downsizing. Of the eleven defense facilities sites engaged in downsizing, the Nevada Test Site experienced the second highest reduction in full time equivalent employees. However, Nevada has received less community transition support than any other qualifying defense facility. The conferees urge the Secretary to ensure equitable worker and community transition funding.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The conference agreement provides the budget request of \$103,796,000 for fissile materials disposition. The Department is commended for its recognition that, despite the controversy it evokes, the burn-up of plutonium in mixed-oxide fuel is the preferred method of disposing of large volumes of weapons grade plutonium. The conferees expect the Department to adhere to the schedule and process for selection of contractors for the mixed-oxide fuel plant and reactors in fiscal year 1998.

However, the conferees direct that the principle objective of the materials disposition program be the conversion of Russian and United States classified materials shapes with special emphasis on weapon primary "pits" into non-weapons usable, verifiable shapes and forms. Material in classified shapes is by far the most attractive for diversion, theft or weapons reassembly, and for that reason this class of material requires immediate attention even if its initial treatment does not lead immediately to final disposition. The conversion of weapons grade plutonium into metallic or oxide forms is acceptable for this step. The choice between oxide or metallic forms should be dictated solely by the rapidity with which the conversion can be accomplished and is dependent upon construction details for different classified shapes. Any delays in this first step predicated on additional research for methods of preparation of materials forms or licensing issues for eventual disposition in mixed-oxide fuel or vitrification are not acceptable. Adequate technologies are available today for conversion of all types of classified shapes.

NUCLEAR ENERGY (DEFENSE)

The conference agreement provides \$35,000,000 for the international nuclear safety program to improve the safety of Soviet-designed nuclear reactors, a decrease of \$15,000,000 from the budget request. The conference agreement does not provide funding for the spent fuel management program nor the Chernobyl shutdown initiative.

OFFICE OF HEARING AND APPEALS

The conference agreement provides \$2,300,000 instead of \$1,900,000 as proposed by

the House and \$2,685,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF DOE PROJECTS

The conference agreement provides \$35,000,000 as proposed by the House to provide for external reviews of the Department's individual construction and privatization projects, and an external review of the Department's facility acquisition management process. The immediate concern of the conferees is a review of all Department of Energy construction projects initiated in fiscal year 1998, construction projects currently in the conceptual design phase, ongoing projects if recommended by the initial assessment required below, and projects proposed by the Department for privatization. These evaluations should include a review and assessment of the quality of the technical scopes, cost estimates, schedules, and supporting data regarding these construction projects, and should make recommendations on the validity of the proposed costs, scopes, and schedules.

While the House bill directed that these reviews be conducted by the Corps of Engineers, the conferees acknowledge that there may be other qualified, unbiased external organizations that could conduct this type of assessment. Therefore, prior to obligating any funds provided for review of these construction and privatization projects, the conferees expect the Department to contract with an impartial independent organization with expertise in the evaluation of government management and administrative functions, for a detailed analysis of the proposed independent assessment of construction projects.

This contract should produce a report to be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not later than December 31, 1997. The report should address the need for conducting independent assessments of the Department's proposed and ongoing construction projects and projects proposed for privatization, assess the proposed content of these reviews as outlined above, as well as recommend the appropriate entity(ies) (including, but not limited to, the Corps of Engineers) to conduct these reviews. The conferees expect this contract to be entered into as soon as possible, and expect the Department to consult with the Appropriations Committees regarding the selection of an independent organization to produce this report.

In addition to the report on the need for an independent assessment of the Department's construction projects, the conferees direct that the Department's overall management structure and process for identifying, managing, designing and constructing facilities also be reviewed by an impartial independent organization with expertise in the evaluation of government management and administrative functions. The report should be provided to the Committees on Appropriations by June 30, 1998. The process used by the Department and its contractors to identify project requirements, develop scopes of work, execute and manage design, prepare cost estimates, select contract types, and execute and manage construction must be examined. The review should assess the level of oversight and experience of field and headquarters Federal personnel involved in this process. The recommendations of the report should include an analysis of the effectiveness of this process, advantages, disadvantages, and recommended improvements with the ultimate goal of establishing an overall departmental process that has more control of the projects and reduces project cost growth and schedule slippages. This study should also include a review of large operating projects such as environmental projects

which may or may not involve much construction, but should clearly be managed with the same principles and guidelines.

NAVAL REACTORS

The conference agreement provides \$670,500,000, instead of \$673,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$660,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. An additional \$30,000,000 over the budget request has been provided to continue test reactor inactivation efforts and environmental cleanup activities which are scheduled to be completed in fiscal year 2002.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

The conference agreement appropriates \$190,000,000 and includes the Senate language providing that funds are available until expended. The House bill did not include this provision.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

In addition to the \$1,000,000 provided by the House and Senate, the conference agreement provides \$2,500,000, as recommended by the Senate, to replace a damaged transmission cable. The conferees are aware that, in addition to the \$3,500,000 provided in this paragraph, the Department has additional funding available from funds appropriated in prior years. Any funds in excess of current requirements shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States upon the sale of the Administration.

The conference agreement includes \$10,000,000 for the Swan Lake—Lake Tyee Intertie project, \$10,000,000 less than the amount recommended by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

A total of \$3,750,000 has been made available to Bonneville as permanent borrowing authority. During fiscal year 1998, Bonneville plans to repay the Treasury \$805,000,000, of which \$228,000,000 is to repay principal on the the Federal investment in these facilities.

The conferees note that the Senate report directs the Northwest Power Planning Council to provide a final hatchery review report by October 1998. As this late date will impede the ability of the Appropriations Committees to incorporate the findings of the review into the fiscal year 1999 appropriations process, the conferees direct the Council to provide the final hatchery review report by June 1998.

Cost control.—The conferees commend Bonneville for its actions in the last three years to reduce planned spending by approximately \$600,000,000 annually and to reduce staffing by 1,000 positions. The conferees believe there is an opportunity, and need, to further reduce costs. The conferees understand that Bonneville and the Northwest Power Planning Council are reviewing Bonneville's planned spending in order to recommend ways for Bonneville to further control costs and have engaged a group of senior business executives to aid in this effort. The conferees support the efforts to assure that limited ratepayer dollars are prudently spent. All program expenditures, other than debt service, must be carefully reviewed by Bonneville to determine whether additional reductions or program terminations can be made to minimize the potential for stranded costs and to keep rates competitive in the wholesale power market. Concurrent with this review, Bonneville staffing levels should continue to be reviewed and adjusted to match changing program needs. The conferees direct that Bonneville and the Council provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by March 1, 1998,

identifying specific recommendations for cost reductions in all non-debt service spending for which Bonneville is responsible. This report should include consideration of which current programs and functions Bonneville should continue to perform in a competitive market, and not focus merely on improved management efficiency.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement includes \$12,222,000, the same amount recommended by the House and the Senate.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement includes \$25,210,000, the same amount recommended by the House.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement provides \$189,043,000, the same amount provided by the House. The conference agreement also includes the Senate recommendation that \$5,592,000 be available as a transfer from the Colorado River Dam Fund.

The conference agreement also includes \$5,592,000, the same amount as the Senate, to be deposited in the Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account.

The conferees are aware of the Western Area Power Administration's proposed distribution of projected fiscal year 1998 costs across several financing sources, including funds appropriated by the Congress. As Federal appropriated funds are reduced while electricity rates drop in the marketplace, the conferees direct that Western keep its wholesale rate as competitive as possible and thereby maintain as robust a repayment stream back to the Treasury as possible.

FALCON AND AMISTAD FUND

The conference agreement includes \$970,000, the same amount recommended by the House.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes \$162,141,000, the same amount recommended by the House and Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 301. The conference agreement includes a provision by the House that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to award a management and operating contract unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures, or the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. At least 60 days before such action, the Secretary of Energy must submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report notifying the Committees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver. Section 301 does not preclude extension of a contract awarded using competitive procedures.

SEC. 302. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to award, amend, or modify a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. At least 60 days before such action, the Secretary of Energy must submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report notifying the Committees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

The conferees direct the Department, as contracts are awarded or renegotiated, to

standardize its contracts in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation. In awarding, amending, or modifying contracts, the Department is directed to be cognizant of and utilize provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation that permit exceptions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation and provisions intended to address the special circumstances entailed by management and operating contracts.

SEC. 303. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to prepare or implement workforce restructuring plans or provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102-484.

SEC. 304. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to augment the \$61,159,000 made available for obligation in this Act for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants authorized under the provisions of section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102-484. This provision does not preclude the Department from proposing a reprogramming if deemed critical to program needs during fiscal year 1998.

SEC. 305. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to prepare or initiate Requests for Proposals for a program if the program has not been funded by Congress.

SEC. 306. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House that permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill.

Provision transferred to Title V.

The general provision proposed by the House to prohibit agency lobbying of Congress has been moved to Title V, and will apply to each agency and department funded in this bill.

Provisions not included in the conference agreement.

The conference agreement does not include the House provision prohibiting the use of funds to award or modify any contract for support services without a cost comparison conducted under the procedures and requirements of Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76.

The conference agreement does not include the House provision prohibiting the use of funds to award or modify a management and operating contract which includes funds for support services contracts for use by Department of Energy personnel.

The conference agreement does not include the House provision requiring an independent assessment before initiation of new construction projects, but funds have been provided for external reviews of the Department's facility acquisition processes and individual construction projects.

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
ENERGY SUPPLY		
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY		
Solar energy		
Solar building technology research.....	4,000	2,720
Photovoltaic energy systems.....	77,000	66,511
Photovoltaic energy research.....	---	2,274
Subtotal, Photovoltaic.....	77,000	68,785
Solar thermal energy systems.....	19,800	16,775
Biomass/biofuels energy systems		
Power systems.....	36,500	28,600
Biofuels.....	40,040	31,150
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems.....	76,540	59,750
Biomass/biofuels energy research.....	---	38,635
Subtotal, Biomass.....	76,540	98,385
Wind energy systems.....	42,858	33,030
Wind energy research.....	---	295
Subtotal, Wind.....	42,858	33,325
Renewable energy production incentive program.....	4,000	3,000
International solar energy program.....	7,000	1,375
Solar technology transfer.....	1,360	---
National renewable energy laboratory.....	2,800	1,000
Construction		
96-E-100 FTLB renovation and expansion, Golden, CO.....	2,200	2,200
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory..	5,000	3,200
Total, Solar Energy.....	237,558	227,565

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
Geothermal		
Geothermal technology development.....	30,000	29,500
	=====	=====
Hydrogen research.....	15,000	16,250
Hydrogen energy research.....	---	3,100
	-----	-----
Total, Hydrogen.....	15,000	19,350
	=====	=====
Hydropower development.....	1,000	750
Renewable Indian energy resources.....	---	4,000
	=====	=====
Electric energy systems and storage		
Electric and magnetic fields R&D.....	8,000	8,000
High temperature superconducting R&D.....	32,500	32,500
Energy storage systems.....	4,000	3,950
Climate challenge.....	1,000	---
	-----	-----
Total, Electric energy systems and storage.....	45,500	44,450
	=====	=====
Federal building/Remote power initiative.....	---	5,000
Program direction.....	15,642	15,651
	=====	=====
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY.....	344,700	346,266
	=====	=====

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference

NUCLEAR ENERGY		
Nuclear energy R&D		
Advanced radioisotope power system.....	47,000	40,500
Oak Ridge landlord.....	9,500	9,500
Test reactor area landlord.....	3,217	3,000
Construction		
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID.....	4,425	4,425
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord.....	7,642	7,425
Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation.....	2,000	---
University reactor fuel assistance and support.....	6,000	7,000
Nuclear energy security.....	39,761	---
Total, Nuclear energy R&D.....	111,903	64,425
	=====	=====
Termination costs.....	76,035	77,035
	=====	=====
Uranium programs.....	79,135	61,600
Construction		
98-U-200 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY.....	400	400
96-U-201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY.....	6,000	2,600
Subtotal, Construction.....	6,400	3,000
	-----	-----
Total, Uranium programs.....	85,535	64,600
	=====	=====
Isotope support.....	21,704	16,000
Program direction.....	16,700	21,000
	=====	=====
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY.....	311,877	243,060
	=====	=====

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
Environment, safety and health.....	62,731	42,500
Program direction.....	46,185	23,550
	=====	=====
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH.....	108,916	66,050
	=====	=====
ENERGY RESEARCH		
Fusion energy sciences program.....	225,000	232,000
	=====	=====
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES		
Technical information management program.....	2,427	1,600
Program direction.....	8,560	7,500
Construction.....	1,000	1,000
	-----	-----
Total, Technical information management program...	11,987	10,100
	=====	=====
Field offices and management.....	100,233	95,000
	=====	=====
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.....	112,220	105,100
	=====	=====
Subtotal, Energy supply.....	1,102,713	992,476
	=====	=====
Renewable energy research program.....	---	-44,304
Use of prior year balances.....	-18,535	-31,535
General reduction for contractor training.....	---	-9,830
	=====	=====
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY 1/.....	1,084,178	906,807
(Energy asset acquisitions).....	(15,322)	---
(Energy supply, research and development).....	(1,068,856)	(906,807)
	=====	=====

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT		
Environmental restoration.....	457,625	275,000
	=====	=====
Waste management.....	153,004	153,004
Construction		
94-E-602 Bethel Valley federal facility	1,900	1,900
agreement upgrades, ORNL.....		
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL....	397	397
	-----	-----
Subtotal, Construction.....	2,297	2,297
	-----	-----
Total, Waste management.....	155,301	155,301
	=====	=====
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization.....	71,758	71,758
	-----	-----
Subtotal, Non-defense environmental management....	684,684	502,059
General reduction.....	---	-5,000
	=====	=====
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT.....	684,684	497,059
	=====	=====

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND		
Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.....	248,788	220,200
	=====	=====
SCIENCE		
High energy physics		
Research and technology.....	205,240	210,240
Facility operations.....	418,945	418,945
Construction		
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab.....	5,500	5,500
98-G-305 C-Zero area experimental hall, Fermilab.....	5,000	5,000
97-G-303 Master substation upgrade, SLAC.....	9,400	9,400
92-G-302 Fermilab main injector, Fermilab.....	30,950	30,950
Subtotal, Construction.....	50,850	50,850
Subtotal, Facility operations.....	469,795	469,795
Total, High energy physics.....	675,035	680,035
	=====	=====
Nuclear physics.....	256,525	261,525
Construction		
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL.....	59,400	59,400
Total, Nuclear physics.....	315,925	320,925
	=====	=====
Biological and environmental research.....	376,710	406,710
	=====	=====
Basic energy sciences		
Materials sciences.....	392,475	392,475
Chemical sciences.....	199,933	199,933
Engineering and geosciences.....	41,371	41,371
Energy biosciences.....	27,461	27,461
Construction		
96-E-300 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L.....	7,000	7,000
Total, Basic energy sciences.....	668,240	668,240
	=====	=====

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
Other energy research		
Computational and technology research.....	175,907	150,907
Energy research analyses.....	1,500	1,500
Program direction.....	30,600	---
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support		
Multiprogram general purpose facilities		
Construction		
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations 1/.	7,259	7,259
95-E-301 Central heating plant rehabilitation, Phase I (ANL).....	3,442	3,442
94-E-363 Roofing improvements (ORNL).....	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	14,701	14,701
Environment, safety and health		
Construction		
96-E-333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations.....	5,273	5,273
95-E-307 Fire safety imp. III (ANL).....	718	718
95-E-308 Sanitary system mods. II (BNL).....	568	568
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health.....	6,559	6,559
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. suppor	21,260	21,260
Total, Other energy research.....	229,267	173,667
Program direction.....	10,200	37,600
Subtotal, Science.....	2,275,377	2,287,177
Use of prior year SSC balances.....	-15,000	-35,000
Use of other prior year balances.....	---	-13,800
General reduction for contractor training.....	---	-2,669
TOTAL, SCIENCE.....	2,260,377	2,235,708
(Science asset acquisitions).....	(138,510)	---
(Science).....	(2,121,867)	(2,235,708)

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<hr/>		
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION		
Administrative operations		
Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses.....	2,850	2,500
General management - personnel compensation and benefits.....	104,530	101,695
General management - other expenses.....	77,356	73,000
Program support		
Minority economic impact.....	2,320	1,650
Policy analysis and system studies.....	2,096	500
Consumer affairs.....	40	40
Public affairs.....	50	50
Environmental policy studies.....	2,500	1,750
Scientific and technical training.....	800	500
Information management.....	8,000	6,000
Subtotal, Program support.....	15,806	10,490
Total, Administrative operations.....	200,542	187,685
Cost of work for others.....	32,062	32,062
Subtotal, Departmental Administration.....	232,604	219,747
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments.....	---	-1,000
Total, Departmental administration (gross).....	232,604	218,747
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-131,330	-131,330
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net).....	101,274	87,417
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL		
Office of Inspector General.....	29,499	27,500

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES		
Stockpile stewardship		
Core stockpile stewardship.....	1,158,290	1,288,290
Construction		
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM.....	46,300	46,300
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations 1/..	51,106	19,810
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory 1/.....	19,800	13,400
96-D-104 Process and environmental technology laboratory, SNL 1/.....	29,820	---
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL 1/.....	26,000	19,300
Subtotal, Construction.....	173,026	98,810
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship.....	1,331,316	1,387,100
Inertial fusion.....	217,000	217,000
Construction		
96-D-111 National ignition facility, TBD 1/.....	876,400	197,800
Subtotal, Inertial fusion.....	1,093,400	414,800
Technology transfer/education		
Technology transfer.....	60,000	56,250
Education.....	9,000	9,000
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education.....	69,000	65,250
Total, Stockpile stewardship.....	2,493,716	1,867,150

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
-----	-----	-----
Stockpile management.....	1,828,465	1,891,265
Construction		
98-D-123 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring init Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SR 1/.....	14,343	11,000
98-D-124 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring init Y-12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN 1/.....	7,311	6,450
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR 1/.....	39,453	9,650
98-D-126 Acceleration prod. of tritium, VL 1/.....	168,590	67,865
97-D-122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM 1/.....	41,292	9,200
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS 1/.....	16,600	---
97-D-124 Steam plant waste water treatment facility, upgrade, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	1,900	1,900
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU) Pantex plant 1/.....	10,600	6,900
96-D-123 Retrofit HVAC and chillers, for Ozone protection Y-12 plant.....	2,700	2,700
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL 1/.....	106,360	5,000
95-D-122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y-12 plant.....	12,600	12,600
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 plant.....	1,400	1,400
94-D-125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant...	2,000	2,000

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
94-D-128 Environmental safety and health analytical laboratory, Pantex plant 1/.....	3,000	---
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant.....	2,100	2,100
92-D-126 replace emergency notification system, VL.....	3,200	3,200
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations.....	19,520	18,920
Subtotal, Construction.....	452,969	160,885
Total, Stockpile management.....	2,281,434	2,052,150
Program direction.....	303,500	250,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities.....	5,078,650	4,169,300
Use of prior year balances.....	---	-2,608
General reduction.....	---	-20,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES.....	5,078,650	4,146,692
(Defense asset acquisitions).....	(1,502,395)	---
(Weapons activities).....	(3,576,255)	(4,146,692)

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.		
Environmental restoration.....	1,356,573	622,973
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution.....	388,000	388,000
	-----	-----
Total, Environmental restoration.....	1,744,573	1,010,973
	=====	=====
Closure projects.....	15,000	---
	=====	=====
Waste management.....	1,455,576	1,490,876
Construction		
98-D-401 H-tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC 1/.....	12,000	1,000
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA 1/.....	41,530	13,961
96-D-408 Waste mgmt upgrades, various locations 1/	12,709	8,200
95-D-402 Install permanent electrical service WIPP, AL.....	176	176
95-D-405 Industrial landfill V and construction/ demolition landfill VII, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	3,800	3,800
95-D-407 219-S Secondary containment upgrade, Richland, WA.....	2,500	2,500
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL.....	1,219	1,219
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA 1/.....	182,800	15,100
93-D-187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC 1/.....	171,969	17,520
92-D-172 Hazardous waste treatment and processing facility, Pantex Plant.....	5,000	5,000
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC.....	1,042	1,042

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA 1/.....	23,573	11,250
Subtotal, Construction.....	458,318	80,768
Total, Waste management.....	1,913,894	1,571,644
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization.....	1,118,114	1,176,114
Construction		
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA 1/.....	13,636	8,136
98-D-700 INEL road rehabilitation, INEL, ID 1/....	10,800	500
97-D-450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC.....	18,000	18,000
97-D-451 B-Plant safety class ventilation upgrades, Richland, WA.....	2,000	2,000
97-D-470 Environment monitoring laboratory/health physics facility, Savannah River, Aiken, SC 1/....	27,780	5,600
97-D-473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah River, Aiken, SC 1/.....	15,200	---
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA.....	16,744	16,744
96-D-461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID.....	2,927	2,927
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID 1/.....	38,500	14,985
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC 1/.....	34,959	8,500
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, SC.....	2,713	2,713

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, ID 1/.....	1,087	602
Subtotal, Construction.....	184,346	80,707
Total, Nuclear materials & fac. stabilization....	1,302,460	1,256,821
Technology development.....	257,881	220,000
Policy and management.....	23,104	20,000
Environmental science program.....	50,000	55,000
Program direction.....	388,251	345,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management.....	5,695,163	4,479,438
General reduction.....	---	-50,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	5,695,163	4,429,438
(Defense asset acquisitions).....	(642,664)	---
(Defense environmental restoration and waste mgmt)	(5,052,499)	(4,429,438)
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS		
Closure projects.....	---	890,800
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION		
Privatization initiatives, various locations.....	1,006,000	200,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT.....	6,058,499	5,520,238

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
Other national security programs		
Nonproliferation and national security		
Verification and control technology		
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D.....	210,000	210,000
Arms control.....	234,600	234,600
Intelligence.....	33,600	33,600
Subtotal, Verification and control technology.	478,200	478,200
Emergency management.....	27,700	20,000
Nuclear safeguards and security.....	47,200	47,200
Security investigations.....	20,000	30,000
Program direction - NN.....	94,900	82,900
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and national security	668,000	658,300
Environment, safety and health (Defense).....	54,000	74,000
Program direction - EH.....	---	20,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	54,000	94,000
Worker and community transition.....	65,800	57,659
Program direction - WT.....	4,700	3,500
Subtotal, Worker and community transition.....	70,500	61,159
Fissile materials disposition.....	99,451	99,451
Program direction - MD.....	4,345	4,345
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition.....	103,796	103,796
Nuclear energy (Defense)		
Nuclear technology research and development:		
Electrometallurgical program.....	25,000	12,000
International nuclear safety:		
Soviet designed reactors.....	50,000	35,000
Nuclear security: Spent fuel management.....	4,000	---
Chornobyl shutdown initiative.....	2,000	---
Subtotal, Nuclear energy (Defense).....	81,000	47,000
Office of hearings and appeals.....	2,685	2,300
Total, Other national security programs.....	979,981	966,555
	=====	=====

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
Independent assessment of DOE projects.....	---	35,000
Naval reactors		
Naval reactors development.....	605,920	635,920
Construction		
98-D-200 Site laboratory facility upgrade, various locations 1/.....	1,200	5,700
97-D-201 Advanced test reactor secondary coolant system refurbishment, INEL, ID 1/.....	4,600	4,600
95-D-200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations 1/.....	1,100	1,100
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID 1/.....	14,900	3,100
Subtotal, Construction.....	21,800	14,500
Subtotal, Naval reactors development.....	627,720	650,420
Program direction.....	20,080	20,080
Total, Naval reactors.....	647,800	670,500
Subtotal, Other defense activities.....	1,627,781	1,672,055
Use of prior year balances.....	---	-6,047
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.....	1,627,781	1,666,008
(Defense asset acquisitions).....	(21,800)	---
(Other defense activities).....	(1,605,981)	(1,666,008)

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Defense nuclear waste disposal.....	190,000	190,000
	=====	=====
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.....	13,597,594	11,522,938
(Defense asset acquisitions).....	(2,166,859)	---
(Atomic energy defense activities).....	(11,430,735)	(11,522,938)
	=====	=====
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS		
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance/program direction.....	1,000	3,500
Capital assets acquisition.....	---	10,000
	=====	=====
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Operation and maintenance/program direction.....	4,313	4,313
Purchase power and wheeling.....	11,909	11,909
	-----	-----
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance.....	16,222	16,222
Use of prior year balances.....	-2,000	-4,000
	-----	-----
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	14,222	12,222
	=====	=====
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Operating expenses.....	2,382	2,382
Purchase power and wheeling.....	57	57
Program direction.....	17,309	17,309
Construction.....	6,752	6,752
	-----	-----
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance.....	26,500	26,500
Use of prior year balances.....	---	-1,290
	-----	-----
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	26,500	25,210
	=====	=====

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Construction and rehabilitation.....	24,243	24,243
System operation and maintenance.....	39,246	39,246
Purchase power and wheeling.....	54,886	54,886
Program direction.....	106,157	106,157
Utah mitigation and conservation.....	5,432	5,432
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance.....	229,964	229,964
Use of prior year balances.....	-35,630	-40,921
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior.....	---	5,592
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	194,334	189,043
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND		
Operation and maintenance.....	1,065	970
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS.....	237,121	240,945
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION		
Federal energy regulatory commission.....	167,577	162,141
FERC revenues.....	-167,577	-162,141
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION.....	---	---
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND		
Discretionary funding.....	190,000	160,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.....	18,433,515	15,898,574

1/ The Request for this account was \$2,999,497. The lower totals shown for the Request and prior year reflect Committee recommendation to combine certain functions of the Office of Energy Research with General Science and Research in a new account, General Science and Other Research Activities, and to create a separate account for Non-Defense Environmental Management.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The conference agreement appropriates \$170,000,000 instead of \$160,000,000 as proposed by both the House and the Senate. The agreement includes \$92,500,000 for the highway development program. In addition, the agreement includes \$10,000,000 for ARC highways, to be allocated at the discretion of the ARC Federal Co-Chairman.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

The conference agreement appropriates \$17,000,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board instead of \$16,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$17,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes \$468,000,000, instead of \$462,700,000 as proposed by the House and \$476,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have provided \$15,000,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, for the Commission's ongoing work to characterize Yucca Mountain as a potential site for a permanent nuclear waste repository. The conference agreement also includes \$2,000,000, the amount provided by the House and Senate, for activities related to commercial vitrification at the Hanford site and \$1,000,000, as provided by the House, for activities related to independent oversight of certain Department of Energy nuclear facilities.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement includes \$4,800,000, the same amount provided by the House and Senate.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

The conference agreement appropriates \$2,600,000 instead of \$2,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The conference agreement includes \$70,000,000 instead of \$0 as proposed by the House and \$86,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes language earmarking \$6,900,000 for Land Between the Lakes. The agreement includes language proposed by the House providing for direct funding by TVA of its nonpower programs, amended to delay its implementation until fiscal year 1999.

The conferees accept the Administration's proposal to terminate appropriated funding for TVA after fiscal year 1998.

It is the view of the conferees that the environmental, stewardship, and economic development activities of the TVA have been of tremendous benefit to the Tennessee Valley region and have contributed substantially to the general prosperity of the country. It is possible, however, that other entities may be well suited to perform the vital public services currently provided by TVA.

Accordingly, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget should undertake a review of the nonpower functions of the TVA to determine whether TVA or some other entity should be responsible for their continued execution. A report based on this review should accompany the fiscal year 1999 budget submission to Congress.

The conferees direct that from non-appropriated funds, TVA shall relocate power lines in the area of the lake development proposed by Union County, Mississippi. The conferees also expect TVA to assist in the preparation of environmental impact statements where necessary.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House in title III of the bill that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of title 18, United States Code. The conferees direct each agency or department to notify the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations by January 15, 1998, of the actions taken to apprise its Federal and contractor employees of this provision.

SEC. 502. The conference agreement includes language proposed by both the House and Senate regarding the purchase of American-made equipment and products, and prohibiting contracts with persons falsely labeling products as made in America.

SEC. 503. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House prohibiting the award of funds to institutions not in compliance with certain requirements regarding campus access for units of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Federal military recruitment personnel.

SEC. 504. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House prohibiting the use of funds to enter into or renew contracts with entities failing to comply with statutory reporting requirements concerning the employment of certain veterans.

SEC. 505. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which provides that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Animas-La Plata project in Colorado and New Mexico except for activities required to comply with the applicable provisions of current law and the continuation of activities pursuant to the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988.

SEC. 506. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which clarifies that the Albuquerque Metropolitan Area Water Reclamation and Reuse project is eligible for construction under Title XVI of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992, Public Law 102-575, as amended. The language has been amended to make technical corrections.

SEC. 507. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which amends the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Treaty Settlement Act of 1994 to increase the appropriations ceiling for the Chandler Pumping Plant feature of the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project.

SEC. 508. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate regarding the construction of recreational features at the Stonewall Jackson Lake project in West Virginia.

SEC. 509. The conference agreement includes a provision allowing the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) to transfer funds to the Department of Energy to be used for development and demonstration of the Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation (AVLIS) technology for uranium enrichment. The funds to be transferred are to be derived from savings achieved by the USEC during fiscal year 1998, and the total amount obligated by the Department may not exceed \$60,000,000.

This provision will permit continued development of the AVLIS technology until the Corporation is sold. The provision is necessitated by the Administration's inability to sell the Corporation in accordance with the Administration's own schedule. Within 30

days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is to provide to the Committees on Appropriations a report on the issues that must be resolved prior to sale of the Corporation and the date on which the Corporation will be sold.

SEC. 510. The conference agreement includes language which provides that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley project until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform to the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters. The language also provides that the costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be classified as reimbursable or non-reimbursable by the Secretary of the Interior as described in the Bureau of Reclamation report entitled, "Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995" and that any future obligation of funds for drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries pursuant to Reclamation law.

SEC. 511. The conference agreement includes language amending the USEC Privatization Act to require the presence of an adequate number of security guards carrying sidearms to ensure maintenance of security at the gaseous diffusion plants.

SEC. 512. High Flux Beam Reactor (HFBR) at Brookhaven National Laboratory—The conference agreement includes bill language prohibiting the use of funds in this or any other Act for the purpose of restarting the High Flux Reactor (HFBR). In fiscal year 1998, the Department of Energy is directed to drain the spent fuel pool, and may add a steel wall liner to the pool so that additional radioactive material may be removed without the threat of leakage. The Department of Energy is also directed to meet the requirements outlined in Suffolk County Sanitary Code Article 12, complete seismic upgrades, and seal the floor drain.

The Department of Energy is also directed to undertake an environmental impact statement (EIS) with respect to the HFBR. The conferees expect that the EIS will be a comprehensive survey of any environmental hazards that the tritium leak or other contamination associated with the HFBR pose to the drinking water and health of the people in the surrounding communities, and that it will provide a detailed plan for remediation. The findings of the EIS and a plan for any necessary remediation shall be reported to Congress.

Provisions not adopted by the conferees

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate that authorized the Secretary of the Interior to use funds appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation to enter into cooperative agreements with willing private landowners for restoration and enhancement of fish, wildlife, and other resources on public or private land within watersheds that contain Bureau of Reclamation projects.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1998 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1997 amount, the 1998 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1998 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year	
1997	\$20,990,027,000

Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1998	23,047,903,000
House bill, fiscal year 1998	20,416,989,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1998	21,209,623,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1998	21,152,202,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1997	+162,175,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1998	-1,895,701,000
House bill, fiscal year 1998	+735,213,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1998	-57,421,000

JOSEPH MCDADE,
HAROLD ROGERS,
JOE KNOLLENBERG,
R. P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
MIKE PARKER,
SONNY CALLAHAN,
JAY DICKEY,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
VIC FAZIO,
PETER J. VISCLOSKEY,
CHET EDWARDS,
ED PASTOR,
DAVID R. OBEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
THAD COCHRAN,
SLADE GORTON,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
ROBERT E. BENNETT,
CONRAD BURNS,
LARRY CRAIG,
TED STEVENS,
HARRY REID,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
PATTY MURRAY,
HERB KOHL,
BYRON L. DORGAN,
DANIEL K. INOUE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in this spirit here this morning of bipartisan cooperation, I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider H.R. 2183, the bipartisan campaign finance bill that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ALLEN] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] and all of our freshmen have joined in.

The SPEAKER. Under the Speaker's announced guidelines, it requires the leaders of both parties and the chairman and ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction to approve that request. The gentleman is not recognized, but the Chair appreciates his bipartisan-spirited tone.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDI- CIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 239 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State

of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2267.

□ 0920

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2267) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. NUSSLE, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, September 25, 1997, the bill was open for amendment from page 90, line 15, through page 90, line 23.

Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, \$35,500,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses of operations and training activities authorized by law, \$65,000,000: *Provided*, That reimbursements may be made to this appropriation from receipts to the "Federal Ship Financing Fund" for administrative expenses in support of that program in addition to any amount heretofore appropriated.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$1,000,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, not to exceed \$3,450,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operations and Training.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Maritime Administration is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Maritime Administration, and payments received therefor shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof: *Provided*, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy for items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

No obligations shall be incurred during the current fiscal year from the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, or otherwise, in excess of the appropriations and limitations contained in this Act or in any prior appropriation Act, and all receipts which otherwise would be de-

posited to the credit of said fund shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

COMMISSION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICA'S HERITAGE ABROAD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses for the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, \$250,000, as authorized by Public Law 99-83, section 1303.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$8,740,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be used to employ consultants: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to employ in excess of four full-time individuals under Schedule C of the Excepted Service exclusive of one special assistant for each Commissioner: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to reimburse Commissioners for more than 75 billable days, with the exception of the Chairperson who is permitted 125 billable days.

COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION REFORM SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Immigration Reform pursuant to section 141(f) of the Immigration Act of 1990, \$496,000, to remain available until expended.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, as authorized by Public Law 94-304, \$1,090,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by section 3 of Public Law 99-7.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as authorized by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206(d) and 621-634), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); non-monetary awards to private citizens; and not to exceed \$27,500,000 for payments to State and local enforcement agencies for services to the Commission pursuant to title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, sections 6 and 14 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991; \$239,740,000: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$2,500 from available funds.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Communications Commission, as authorized by law, including uniforms and allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-02; not to exceed \$600,000 for land and structure; not to exceed \$500,000 for improvement and care of grounds and repair to buildings; not to exceed \$4,000 for official reception and representation expenses; purchase (not to exceed 16) and hire of motor vehicles; special counsel fees; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$187,079,000, of which not to exceed \$300,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999, for research and policy studies: *Provided*, That \$152,523,000 of offsetting collections shall be assessed and collected pursuant to section 9 of title I of the

Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1998 so as to result in a final fiscal year 1998 appropriation estimated at \$34,556,000: *Provided further*, That any offsetting collections received in excess of \$152,523,000 in fiscal year 1998 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1998.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 App. U.S.C. 1111), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-02; \$13,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$95,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$300,000 shall be available for use to contract with a person or persons for collection services in accordance with the terms of 31 U.S.C. 3718, as amended: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$70,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18(a)) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1998, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1998 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any fees received in excess of \$70,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1998: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Federal Trade Commission shall be available for obligation for expenses authorized by section 151 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-242, 105 Stat. 2282-2285).

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES
CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, as amended, \$141,000,000, of which \$134,575,000 is for basic field programs and required independent audits; \$1,125,000 is for the Office of Inspector General, of which such amounts as may be necessary may be used to conduct additional audits of recipients; and \$5,300,000 is for management and administration.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—LEGAL SERVICES
CORPORATION

SEC. 501. (a) CONTINUATION OF COMPETITIVE SELECTION PROCESS.—None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services

Corporation may be used to provide financial assistance to any person or entity except through a competitive selection process conducted in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Corporation in accordance with the criteria set forth in subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 503 of Public Law 104-134 (110 Stat. 1321-52 et seq.).

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROCEDURES.—Sections 1007(a)(9) and 1011 of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996f(a)(9) and 2996j) shall not apply to the provision, denial, suspension, or termination of any financial assistance using funds appropriated in this Act.

(c) ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES.—If, during any term of a grant or contract awarded to a recipient by the Legal Services Corporation under the competitive selection process referred to in subsection (a) and applicable Corporation regulations, the Corporation finds, after notice and opportunity for the recipient to be heard, that the recipient has failed to comply with any requirement of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996f et seq.), this Act, or any other applicable law relating to funding for the Corporation, the Corporation may terminate the grant or contract and institute a new competitive selection process for the area served by the recipient, notwithstanding the terms of the recipient's grant or contract.

SEC. 502. (a) CONTINUATION OF REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS.—None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by, or contrary to any of the provisions of—

(1) sections 501, 502, 505, 506, and 507 of Public Law 104-134 (110 Stat. 1321-51 et seq.), and all funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as set forth in such sections, except that all references in such sections to 1995 and 1996 shall be deemed to refer instead to 1997 and 1998, respectively; and

(2) section 504 of Public Law 104-134 (110 Stat. 1321-53 et seq.), and all funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions set forth in such section, except that—

(A) subsection (c) of such section 504 shall not apply;

(B) paragraph (3) of section 508(b) of Public Law 104-134 (110 Stat. 1321-58) shall apply with respect to the requirements of subsection (a)(13) of such section 504, except that all references in such section 508(b) to the date of enactment shall be deemed to refer to April 26, 1996; and

(C) subsection (a)(11) of such section 504 shall not be construed to prohibit a recipient from using funds derived from a source other than the Corporation to provide related legal assistance to—

(i) an alien who has been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty in the United States by a spouse or a parent, or by a member of the spouse's or parent's family residing in the same household as the alien and the spouse or parent consented or acquiesced to such battery or cruelty; or

(ii) an alien whose child has been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty in the United States by a spouse or parent of the alien (without the active participation of the alien in the battery or extreme cruelty), or by a member of the spouse's or parent's family residing in the same household as the alien and the spouse or parent consented or acquiesced to such battery or cruelty, and the alien did not actively participate in such battery or cruelty.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(C):

(1) The term "battered or subjected to extreme cruelty" has the meaning given such

term under regulations issued pursuant to subtitle G of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (Pub. L. 103-322; 108 Stat. 1953).

(2) The term "related legal assistance" means legal assistance directly related to the prevention of, or obtaining of relief from, the battery or cruelty described in such subsection.

SEC. 503. (a) CONTINUATION OF AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of section 509 of Public Law 104-134 (110 Stat. 1321-58 et seq.), other than subsection (l) of such section, shall apply during fiscal year 1998.

(b) REQUIREMENT OF ANNUAL AUDIT.—An annual audit of each person or entity receiving financial assistance from the Legal Services Corporation under this Act shall be conducted during fiscal year 1998 in accordance with the requirements referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 504. (a) DEBARMENT.—The Legal Services Corporation may debar a recipient, on a showing of good cause, from receiving an additional award of financial assistance from the Corporation. Any such action to debar a recipient shall be instituted after the Corporation provides notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the recipient.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Legal Services Corporation shall promulgate regulations to implement this section.

(c) GOOD CAUSE.—In this section, the term "good cause", used with respect to debarment, includes—

(1) prior termination of the financial assistance of the recipient, under part 1640 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or any similar corresponding regulation or ruling);

(2) prior termination in whole, under part 1606 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or any similar corresponding regulation or ruling), of the most recent financial assistance received by the recipient, prior to date of the debarment decision;

(3) substantial violation by the recipient of the statutory or regulatory restrictions that prohibit recipients from using financial assistance made available by the Legal Services Corporation or other financial assistance for purposes prohibited under the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996 et seq.) or for involvement in any activity prohibited by, or inconsistent with, section 504 of Public Law 104-134 (110 Stat. 1321-53 et seq.), section 502(a)(2) of Public Law 104-208 (110 Stat. 3009-59 et seq.), or section 502(a)(2) of this Act;

(4) knowing entry by the recipient into a subgrant, subcontract, or other agreement with an entity that had been debarred by the Corporation; or

(5) the filing of a lawsuit by the recipient, on behalf of the recipient, as part of any program receiving any Federal funds, naming the Corporation, or any agency or employee of a Federal, State, or local government, as a defendant.

Mr. ROGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 104, line 2, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 104, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 505. (a) Not later than January 1, 1998, the Legal Services Corporation shall implement a system of case information disclosure which shall apply to all basic field programs which receive funds from the Legal Services Corporation from funds appropriated in this Act.

(b) Any basic field program which receives Federal funds from the Legal Services Corporation from funds appropriated in this Act must disclose to the public in written form, upon request, and to the Legal Services Corporation in semiannual reports, the following information about each case filed by its attorneys in any court:

(1) The name and full address of each party to the legal action unless such information is protected by an order or rule of a court or by State or Federal law or revealing such information would put the client of the recipient of such Federal funds at risk of physical harm.

(2) The cause of action in the case.

(3) The name and address of the court in which the case was filed and the case number assigned to the legal action.

(c) The case information disclosed in semiannual reports to the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 239, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and a Member opposed, each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to require programs funded by the Legal Services Corporation to disclose to the public and the LSC the most basic information about litigation in which LSC grantees are involved. I thought we had agreement on this. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], who is one of the proponents of the Legal Services Corporation, and I had some lengthy discussions about this, and I thought the amendment had been agreed to, but the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], I understand, has some opposition, so we will probably have to get into a somewhat lengthy debate.

The information that would be disclosed would be the name and the address of each party, the legal action, the cause of action, the name and address of the court in which the case is filed, and the case number assigned to the legal action. In those instances where an address and name are not disclosed for reasons of security, such as in the case of a battered wife or where children are abused, that information would not be disclosed because it is not currently disclosed, even though it is in the records in the courts.

This basic information is not privileged, and as I said before, such information is on file currently in court records. Nothing disclosed would be in violation of the attorney-client privilege, and it is important to note that my amendment does not disclose any information that is not already public information. My amendment simply

makes accessible what is highly inaccessible right now.

Case disclosure will not be burdensome. According to the LSC budget request for fiscal year 1998, only 8 percent of the Legal Services caseload is litigated, requiring public disclosure. Basic information about the case being litigated would not constitute a burden on the resources of local programs.

Now, here is why the amendment is needed, and I hope all of my colleagues are paying attention. Public disclosure of Government-funded activities is essential for honest, open Government. Other Government programs are subject to a variety of public disclosure requirements; for example, the Federal Election Commission. While the LSC is subject to the Freedom of Information Act and other disclosure requirements, it is approximately 280 grantees that expend 97 percent of the LSC budget are not subject to the Freedom of Information Act. Given the large number of controversial and abusive cases that have been associated with the LSC over the past several years, in violation of congressional mandates, disclosure of cases would let the sun shine on the everyday work of the LSC.

The LSC was funded at \$283 million in 1997 over the objections of many of us. What kind of assurances does Congress get that the LSC is following guidelines and restrictions?

□ 0930

The answer is clearly none. The American people want to know what their taxpayers' dollars are being spent on. As I said before, we are going to protect those who would be in jeopardy, such as battered children or wives.

The LSC has not reformed itself and continues to disregard congressional intent. So I think this is a good amendment. I thought we had bipartisan support for it. Evidently we do have some objections.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] opposed to the amendment?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, at best this amendment is unnecessary. I am advised by the Legal Services Corporation that it is extremely burdensome and costly. Some of the privacy concerns that many had with regard to this amendment originally, some had been addressed by the gentleman, and I would be pleased to look at those as the process moves forward, and particularly in conference.

But at this point, Mr. Chairman, the changes in the reporting system would be costly. The amendment does not ad-

dress any identified problem, really, nor does it serve any specific purpose. It costs a considerable amount. We appreciate his addressing some of the other concerns, but just because of the unnecessariness, we have a tight budget, and this has put additional administrative burdens, something that the gentleman has fought against for many years, putting paperwork burdens, administrative burdens on people. That is what this really does, representing a considerable additional cost. On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I have to at this point oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. It is my understanding that the amendment requires disclosure only of information that is already a matter of public record under court rules or applicable Federal or State law. I believe the amendment will merely facilitate appropriate oversight of federally funded LSC grantees. In fact, I appreciate the gentleman bringing this matter to our attention, and I am glad to support the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], a member of the committee.

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am still just confounded by what practical difference the gentleman believes his amendment will make.

If we are talking about oversight, we already have a requirement and generally administrative practice on the part of Legal Services Corp. grantees to track the kinds of cases that they are involved in. The gentleman's amendment takes that a step further. That gives names and addresses of plaintiffs and defendants, as well as other case file information which is public information, if we want to go to the court and dig it out, as the gentleman knows.

But to require the expenditure of additional time and resources to an already strapped program in order to pull this information together, which will add nothing to our oversight capabilities, but will make susceptible to invasions of privacy inappropriate efforts by any number of likely people who want to exploit this kind of address list, I really do not understand what the gentleman believes he is going to accomplish by this, other than further burdening the people that are trying to provide legal services.

The gentleman signed, along with several of his colleagues, a "Dear Colleague" a few days ago laying out three

particularly, by his lights, I gather, egregious cases. The facts in all of those cases I think have been substantially rebutted by the realities that were involved and that necessitated Legal Services' intervention.

I would ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], what will we learn from this that we do not already know that will make a difference in appropriate oversight?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the gentleman, and would ask him to repeat his question, if he would.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the question is, What will we learn if this amendment becomes law that we do not already know, that will make a real difference in our ability to do oversight of the Legal Services Corp.?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The situation right now is if we want information, we have two choices. We can go through all the court records, as the gentleman just mentioned, which is a very cumbersome task, or we can go to the Federal LSC offices. Only 8 percent of the cases are really divulged by the LSC. That means 92 percent are not. They already have those records at the local LSC office. We put protections in there for the battered wives and so forth.

Mr. SKAGGS. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman has not responded to my inquiry. We already have information at each LSC grantee of the types of cases they have done. The gentleman's amendment adds names, addresses, case numbers to that.

What additional value is there in this information that is not already available to either Members of Congress or our staff or LSC corporate auditors, that justifies the additional significant expense and computer programming and administrative costs that will be imposed?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, I do not think there will be any additional expenses. The records are already there.

Mr. SKAGGS. Reclaiming my time—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I will answer the gentleman's question, but he obviously does not want to hear.

Mr. SKAGGS. I do want to hear.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the thrust of this amendment is to bring more accountability, and I stress that word, accountability, to the Members of Congress, and therefore to the American

people, of the workings of the Legal Services entities in the various communities across the Nation.

In the last 20 years we have heard anecdote after anecdote about the kinds of abuses that have been foisted upon the American public by the Legal Services Corp. and entities in the local communities.

Now, the proponents always say, they are just anecdotes. If we pile up the anecdotes we have an entire encyclopedia. Therefore, they become worrisome and repetitive across the Nation.

One egregious example that should have the American people sit up and take notice is the following. If legal services was set up to help low-income poor people, as it was, I support that, and I favor that. Every move that I have made in Congress as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this has been to preserve legal services for the poor.

If that be the case, then understand this example. We have housing authorities across the Nation who are aided and abetted in their work for their tenants by tenants' associations, tenants' groups. Those are tenants' groups made up of low-income resident people of the low-income housing areas.

When they get together and complain that legal services is thwarting their tenants' objectives in trying to evict drug dealers, these are low-income people who are victims of the legal services intervention to try to protect a drug dealer tenant against a majority of tenants who are low-income poor people, who dread the presence of a drug dealer.

That means to me that that kind of anecdote, which cannot be dismissed because it is happening across the Nation, is the kind of case that can be prevented if we have full accountability. If we would know, as Members of Congress, at the outset that a legal services entity is committing itself to the representation of a drug dealer tenant against low-income people, against poor people, against low-income tenants who need legal services to preserve their housing area free from drug dealers, then how can anyone doubt that we need more accountability?

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] just a while ago said it is unnecessary to have this, meaning that he favors accountability, and he believes that accountability in its present status is enough.

I say that if we pass the gentleman's amendment as it stands now on the floor, all we do is crystalize what the gentleman from West Virginia says already exists, and furthermore, allows reporting to the Members of Congress of what goes on on a daily basis in the legal services community.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, whatever the merits of the argument the gentleman has just made, the Burton

amendment will not address them. It has nothing to do with the points the gentleman made.

Mr. GEKAS. Yes, it does. It brings the Congress into full acknowledgment of what is happening in the local communities. If there is additional reporting required by the Burton amendment, which in fact there is additional reporting, then we are all the better for it, and the abuses that have been piling up for 20 years could begin to dwindle, at least if the present status of legal services is to be continued.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania's representations about my position here, this may be a bit of role reversal, but we are arguing for less paperwork and less administrative responsibility here because this information is already available, virtually. So the gentleman is correct, except we are opposing the amendment simply on the basis that it is unnecessary. It does not do anything, so why do this?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, if I could continue the conversation with the sponsor of the amendment, I was not trying to be difficult. I just ran out of time before.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the gentleman's amendment, in addition to records that are already required to be kept by a legal services grantee, the gentleman's amendment would require disclosure of the name and address of each party to a legal action. Is that correct?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, those are already records kept by the local LSC, but not disclosed unless you go through the national LSC.

Mr. SKAGGS. Then the cause of action, that is information collected as a matter of course by legal services grantees now, is that not correct?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SKAGGS. The name and address of the court in which the case is filed, is that part of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. But it is all kept now by the local LSC. We are not contesting what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. SKAGGS. What more will we be able to do, having all of this additional information collated with new computer programs and so forth, that we cannot now do?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The bottom line is this. Many of us feel like we are spending \$283 million and that is excessive. We want to help the indigent, everybody does, but we believe there should be more accountability. Even though Congress passed, a couple of

years ago, some rules regarding LSC, in the last 2 years there have been violations of those rules. All we want to do is make sure there is accountability.

The bottom line is this, that those records are there. If we could get them from the local LSC instead of going through the paperwork at the national level, we think it would be easier to make sure there is accountability and there are no abuses. We are not asking for anything but more accountability. It is just that simple. The records are there. I do not think it is going to cost anymore than it does already.

Mr. SKAGGS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, at least the legal services grantee in metropolitan Denver, realizing that they have not had a whole lot of time to figure out what this would cost, estimates it is probably a \$20,000 a year proposition to deal with all of the additional data management and computer changes that are involved.

Given, as the gentleman's comments have indicated, this information is already available, not necessarily pulled together in just the fashion that his amendment would require, it is somewhat bewildering to figure out why we should be spending this additional money.

Mr. Chairman, I assume the real concern that we are trying to address here is that legal services are getting into kinds of cases that are proscribed under the restrictions that are now in law.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SKAGGS. That information is now readily available. It does not require names and addresses. That does not add anything to understanding the kinds of cases of either plaintiffs or defendants. It does not require names of courts attached to those kinds of cases. We already know that. It can be gotten at without the additional burdens that gentleman's amendment would impose on these strapped operations.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the discussion.

Mr. SKAGGS. I do want to prolong it, because we are getting somewhere.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. This information, if you really want to get it, you can go to the court records, a cumbersome thing, and it takes a lot of time to dig through records that you do not want to go through, or you can go to the national LSC and get it. What I am saying is they can get it from the local LSC.

Mr. SKAGGS. Reclaiming my time, the local operation already keeps records by the kinds of cases they are litigating. If that is the gentleman's concern, that they are getting into kinds of cases that they should not, that information exists.

What additional benefit is it in the gentleman's mind to note names and addresses of plaintiffs and defendants and the address of the court? How can that make any difference in our under-

standing of the kinds of cases that are being litigated?

□ 0945

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that more detailed information gives us more of an oversight of the actual operation of the local LSC that may be in violation of the current statutes that we pass here in the Congress, and we know those exist.

Mr. SKAGGS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, if we have a class action being brought and that record exists at the local office, what difference does it make to our oversight needs in knowing the names of all the defendants and plaintiffs collected in a different manner than is now the case or where the court happens to be? We have what we need if we know they are doing a kind of case that is not permitted, do we not?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The only way we can get the information is to dig through court records or go to the national LSC, and we say we want to go to the local LSC.

Now, actually, we are asking for more information than what the gentleman wants us to have, but we think that is part of the policing effort that is necessary to make sure they are accountable.

Mr. SKAGGS. Reclaiming my time, I am not complaining about the information we need to do oversight. That already exists at the local level.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. We cannot get it at the local level unless we go through the local LSC.

Mr. SKAGGS. If all the gentleman is concerned about is that they are getting into the kinds of cases the gentleman does not like and that are proscribed, why do we not limit the gentleman's amendment to making sure they have available at the local level an accounting for the kinds of lawsuits being brought, to see whether any of those violate the restrictions?

Why does the gentleman need this other information that will be costly and burdensome for the local legal services operations to put together?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. We want to make sure. We want to make sure we are covering the waterfront so that there is no problem and they are not covering up something.

Mr. SKAGGS. Reclaiming my time, I think it is transparent. The only reason to go through these extra steps is to be a gratuitous burden on the operation that the gentleman thinks we should not be doing at all.

I think his position is self-evident, although we are trying to dance around other rationales for putting this costly additional burden on these operations, which I think is very regrettable. I hope my colleagues will vote "no."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me just say they are not going to be overburdened. The information is already in their files. This makes it easi-

er to police it, though, because the people who want to police LSC do not have to go through the machinations of going to Washington, DC to get the information. They can get it through the local LSC office.

The fact of the matter is the local LSC offices do not really want to give that information out. They have it. It will not be an additional burden. I do not understand the argument.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the amendment by my colleague from Indiana; [Mr. BURTON].

I believe everyone should have access to legal services, but in the case of Legal Services Corp., it is no longer just defending individuals, it is bullying employers, specifically farmers. The Legal Services Corp. is not just representing but it is, instead, prosecuting and twisting the laws originally intended to shield those who need protection, to badger legitimate and honest small business people.

In southern New Jersey we have a thriving agricultural industry, and it is common between employers and employees at times in any arena. And occasionally there is litigation between the farmers and workers over various employment issues. The Legal Services Corp. is there to provide representation for the workers who are often unable financially to secure legal representation on their own.

However, the complaint I frequently hear from the farmers in my district and from my State is that the Legal Services Corp. attorneys pursue such litigation recklessly, with questionable tactics and motives; again, with questionable tactics and motives.

Let me share two examples that occurred in my district. A farmer from Salem County, NJ, settled a multiple plaintiff claim for \$500 per worker, the total amount to be put in escrow and distributed by the Legal Services Corp. in Puerto Rico where the plaintiffs lived.

LSC first reported to the farmer there was a \$500 surplus which he would get back. Just earlier this year, however, LSC wrote informing him that a man had walked in claiming to have worked for the farmer and was entitled to the \$500, just upon that claim of walking in. LSC let the farmer know that he could respond via his attorney within 20 days or the \$500 would be given to the plaintiff.

This is insanity. Despite this, the farmer had no record of the claimant ever working for him. It would have cost him more than \$500 just to respond through his attorney, so he was forced to allow the distribution and forego the surplus.

Another farmer from Atlanta County, NJ, called the local police to escort a disruptive worker with a weapon off

his property. LSC got involved and 2 years later their lawyers filed a claim against the farmer for eviction. This farmer took it to the U.S. Department of Labor arbitration and won. Legal Services Corp. refused to appear at the arbitration. They refused to appear at the arbitration but, instead, pursued a case in court against the farmer and the city.

The case against the farmer is still going on and LSC refuses to settle for less than \$11,000. Think about that. After the police escort someone from his home who has threatened him with an ice pick he got sued for eviction.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, these are the kinds of abuses that continuously take place. I strongly support the gentleman's amendment because we have to start to rectify these many problems that are going after by legal services who are targeting farmers of moderate means, farmers of moderate means who are forced into settlements that do not make any sense. This is wrong. It needs to be corrected.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but observing in response to the prior gentleman's points that they had nothing to do with the substance of the amendment before the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

(Mr. HOSTETTLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on behalf of the Burton amendment, which I believe would create an additional level of assurance that legal services programs are working effectively and responsibly.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for his willingness to work with me to address some of my concerns regarding the language of his original amendment. While we may differ in our views on the need to continue funding for legal services programs, I know we share the same interest in seeing that any federally funded program is efficient, effective, and operates in the sunshine of public scrutiny.

Earlier, during the consideration of this bill, we debated on the adequate funding level for low income legal services. I was pleased the House exercised its will to support by a broad margin a higher funding level than was included in the committee mark. During debate, many Members expressed concerns about the activities of several legal aid agencies around the country. I do not

take these concerns lightly, however the charges levied I believe in most, if not all cases, are exaggerated beyond the issue of whether or not they are appropriate in the new environment of the reformed Legal Services Corp.

We must be certain the information provided from this legislation is used responsibly and not to harass the agencies or the clients. I appeal to those who are pressing this amendment and ask that this information not be used to further inflame the rhetoric fostered by outside groups, but that it be used within the proper congressional oversight that should be conducted over every taxpayer's dollar.

I do believe that public exposure can be positive, and I will support the amendment. I continue to have minor concerns about the details and process included in the amendment, however I am hopeful the gentleman from Indiana will give further consideration to these concerns and that we can work them out in conference committee.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. NUSSLE]. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments at this point in the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Marine Mammal Commission as authorized by title II of Public Law 92-522, as amended, \$1,000,000.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Securities and Exchange Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and not to exceed \$3,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$283,000,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 may be used toward funding a permanent secretariat for the International Organization of Securities Commissions, and of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials, members of their delegations, appropriate representatives and staff to exchange views concerning developments relating to securities matters, development and implementation of cooperation agreements concerning securities matters and provision of technical assistance for the development of foreign securities markets, such expenses to include necessary logistic and administrative expenses and the expenses of Commission staff and foreign invitees in attendance at such consultations and meetings including (1) such incidental expenses as meals taken in the course of such attendance, (2) any travel and transportation to or from such meetings, and (3) any other related lodging or subsistence: *Provided*, That fees and charges authorized by

sections 6(b)(4) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)(4)) and 31(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee(d)) shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$249,523,000 of such offsetting collections shall be available until expended for necessary expenses of this account: *Provided further*, That the total amount appropriated for fiscal year 1998 under this heading shall be reduced as all such offsetting fees are deposited to this appropriation so as to result in a final total fiscal year 1998 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than \$33,477,000: *Provided further*, That any such fees collected in excess of \$249,523,000 shall remain available until expended but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1998.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration as authorized by Public Law 103-403, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344, and not to exceed \$3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$235,047,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator is authorized to charge fees to cover the cost of publications developed by the Administration, and certain loan servicing activities: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, revenues received from all such activities shall be credited to this account, to be available for carrying out these purposes without further appropriations: *Provided further*, That \$75,500,000 shall be available to fund grants for performance in fiscal year 1998 or fiscal year 1999 as authorized by section 21 of the Small Business Act, as amended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 1-11, as amended by Public Law 100-504), \$9,490,000.

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, \$187,100,000, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 631 note, of which \$45,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 1998, commitments to guarantee loans under section 503 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, shall not exceed the amount of financings authorized under section 20(n)(2)(B) of the Small Business Act, as amended.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$94,000,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of disaster loans and associated administrative expenses, \$199,100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs for direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That of the amounts available under this heading, \$500,000 shall be transferred to and merged with appropriations for the Office of Inspector General of the Small Business Administration for audits and reviews of disaster loans and the disaster loan program.

SURETY BOND GUARANTEES REVOLVING FUND

For additional capital for the "Surety Bond Guarantees Revolving Fund", authorized by the Small Business Investment Act,

as amended, \$3,500,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 631 note.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Small Business Administration in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this paragraph shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the State Justice Institute, as authorized by the State Justice Institute Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-572 (106 Stat. 4515-4516)), \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 602. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 603. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 604. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of each provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 605. (a) None of the funds provided under this Act, or provided under previous appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 1998, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds which (1) creates new programs; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or (6) contracts out or privatizes any functions, or activities presently performed by Federal employees; unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified fifteen days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided under this Act, or provided under previous appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 1998, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or ex-

penditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming of funds in excess of \$500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or (3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified fifteen days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

SEC. 606. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the construction, repair (other than emergency repair), overhaul, conversion, or modernization of vessels for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in shipyards located outside of the United States.

SEC. 607. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 608. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission covering harassment based on religion, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which such funds are made available that such guidelines do not differ in any respect from the proposed guidelines published by the Commission on October 1, 1993 (58 Fed. Reg. 51266).

SEC. 609. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to pay for any cost incurred for (1) opening or operating any United States diplomatic or consular post in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam that was not operating on July 11, 1995; (2) expanding any United States diplomatic or consular post in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam that was operating on July 11, 1995; or (3) increasing the total number of personnel assigned to United States diplomatic or consular posts in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam above the levels existing on July 11, 1995, unless the President certifies within 60 days, based upon all information available to the United States Government that the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is cooperating in full faith with the United States in the following four areas:

(1) Resolving discrepancy cases, live sightings and field activities.

(2) Recovering and repatriating American remains.

(3) Accelerating efforts to provide documents that will help lead to fullest possible accounting of POW/MIA's.

(4) Providing further assistance in implementing trilateral investigations with Laos.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DOGGETT

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. DOGGETT:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . . None of the funds provided by this Act shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products, or to seek the reduction or removal by any foreign country of restrictions on the marketing of such products.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOGGETT

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DOGGETT:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. . . None of the funds provided by this Act shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products, or to seek the reduction or removal by any foreign country of restrictions on the marketing of tobacco or tobacco products, except for restrictions which are not applied equally to all tobacco or tobacco products of the same type.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, September 25, 1997, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes on both amendments.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment is acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] may control the 15 minutes in opposition.

There was no objection.

□ 1000

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. The substitute amendment is before us as having been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DOGGETT. And, Mr. Chairman, I will have 15 minutes in support of the substitute amendment. And who will have 15 minutes in opposition to that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there a Member opposed to that amendment?

Without objection, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] will control the 15 minutes in opposition.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment concerns the health of our children, the

children of the entire world. The dangers of nicotine addiction to our children are now increasingly known. Three thousand young Americans each day become caught up in the nicotine habit, our leading cause of preventable death in America.

But these dangers do not stop at our country's shores. With increasing pressure to stop hooking kids here at home on nicotine, the big tobacco companies are spreading out around the globe to hook other people's kids. To make matters worse, American tax dollars, our tax dollars, have been used to promote addicting our people's children to the nicotine drug. This amendment would put a stop to that.

Since 1990, while Phillip Morris sales have grown by only 4.7 percent here in the United States, they have grown by 80 percent abroad. Smoking causes about 3 million deaths each year around the world. And it is estimated that in another couple of decades, the number will rise to 10 million, with 70 percent of all deaths from smoking coming into developing countries that are the newest targets of big tobacco.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Government and the U.S. taxpayer has been complicit in this export of death. Government employees in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative and the Commerce and State Departments, economic and commercial counselors around the globe have assisted American tobacco companies overseas to break down barriers, and the result has been more kids around the globe are smoking.

One of the examples comes from our Embassy in Thailand, where instead of promoting health, our taxpayer dollars were used to try to discourage health restrictions. This amendment would put a stop to that and would ensure that America provides leadership in protecting children around the world instead of exposing them to disease.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE], one of the coauthors of this amendment.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, tobacco does not discriminate. Tobacco kills people, young and old, black and white, American and Thai alike. Yet it seems that our Government discriminates when it comes to tobacco.

At home, the U.S. Government spends millions of dollars every year on tobacco prevention programs and is currently engaged in the most aggressive effort to date to curb youth smoking in America. But abroad in Asia, Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, the U.S. Government works hand in hand with tobacco companies to promote its product and increase its use in the overseas marketplace. What does this say about how our Government values human life? Is a life in downtown Washington more precious than a life in Bangkok? Tobacco does not discriminate, and neither should we.

There is a real difference between a company voicing legitimate inter-

national trade concerns and the tobacco industry's use of the Federal Government as a school yard bully to force foreign governments to subject their young to a barrage of cigarette marketing. It is a black eye for American diplomacy.

There is no doubt the entry of American tobacco overseas has dramatically increased consumption worldwide. In Taiwan, smoking rates of high school students jumped from 22 to 32 percent in the 2 years after American cigarettes were introduced. In Korea, the rate for male teens grew from 18 to 30 percent in just 1 year. In Japan, 26 percent of high school senior girls were smoking in 1990 after U.S. cigarettes were introduced.

Let us face it, tobacco companies do not need an extra boost from our Government to thrive overseas. That is why since 1993 we have banned such activity by the Agriculture Department by prohibiting the agency from promoting tobacco through the market access program.

As Congress embarks on the historic negotiations to reduce smoking at home, it would be inhumane for us to continue supporting this smoking abroad.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], who has been one of the leaders in trying to protect other children from tobacco.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this amendment. This is just common sense. Tobacco kills. U.S. taxpayer dollars should not be used to help the tobacco industry market this deadly product.

This is not a car. It is not a computer. It is not some piece of technology which is going to help to improve the quality of life. It is a product that, in fact, kills people. We have seen the dangers of smoking right here at home. We have spent billions of dollars on health care for people with tobacco-related diseases.

We should not be in the business to allow the tobacco industry to turn its gaze outward to the untapped markets across the world. Now that their market shares are beginning to decline in the United States, our Government has no business using taxpayer dollars to help the tobacco industry export this deadly product.

The Department of Agriculture is already barred from promoting tobacco through the market access program. This amendment would simply make Federal policy consistent across the Departments.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAMPSON].

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, if we respect the way tobacco products are marketed in this Nation because we are concerned about the documented health risks, how can we in good conscience use taxpayer funds to help to-

bacco companies market their products overseas in nations where no restrictions are placed on their tactics which overwhelmingly target children? It is indefensible.

As this Nation works to finalize a settlement that will force tobacco companies to reimburse States and individuals for the illnesses caused by many of their products, we must not be aiding the efforts to export those illnesses overseas. In fact, a New York Times editorial recently pointed out American tobacco companies have agreed to proposed domestic settlement in part because it does not touch them overseas where profits are soaring and they can boldly target teenagers without fear of lawsuit or powerful critics.

In this Nation nearly 30 years of antismoking efforts, because of it and despite it, American children still recognize Joe Camel as much as they recognize Mickey Mouse. In Hong Kong, empty packs of American cigarettes can be redeemed for tickets to movies and discos and concerts. In the mid-1980's our own U.S. Trade Representative demanded and won the right for American tobacco companies to advertise in Korea and Taiwan. No wonder tobacco consumption is growing at the fastest rate in the world in Asia.

I believe this Nation should be exporting antismoking efforts, but at the very least, we should stop aiding the efforts of the tobacco companies overseas. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, are there no speakers in opposition? I have some other speakers. I wanted to be sure I was not going to be faced with other speakers at the end.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, no, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is going to have a clear field here.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], who has done as much as anyone in this Congress to deal with the plague of this preventable disease caused by tobacco.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Doggett-Meehan-Hansen-DeGette amendment.

Simply put, we can no longer continue to promote and facilitate the overseas sale of preventable death. In 1995 alone, Mr. Chairman, tobacco products killed 3 million people worldwide. According to the World Health Organization, 500 million people alive today will die due to smoking-related illness. It is hypocritical at best and immoral at worst for us to continue on our present course.

At a time when we are working to improve the health of our citizens, it should not be the policy of the U.S. Government to promote the sale and marketing of death and disease abroad. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is about our Government's complicity in big tobacco's export on an epidemic scale.

Here in the United States, smoking rates among adults have finally begun to decline. In response to a shrinking domestic market, the American tobacco companies have turned their attention to the independent national market, particularly developing nations in Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, international sales of Philip Morris and R.J. Reynolds have already quadrupled in the last 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of this amendment do not mention the fact that American tobacco companies are unleashing an unprecedented advertising and marketing campaign on unsophisticated and vulnerable consumers all across the world. Further, they conveniently forget to mention that American tobacco companies have targeted women, the vast majority of whom had not previously smoked, by linking the women's movement with the smoking of cigarettes.

It is abundantly clear that the American tobacco companies are looking overseas for future profits. With this amendment, we must decide whether or not we, as a nation, will facilitate big tobacco's overseas campaign. Currently we are willing accomplices to the worldwide addition of children to tobacco products. Thus, we had have contributed to these untimely deaths.

How can we on the one hand seek to protect our children from the ravages of nicotine addiction while promoting the activities of tobacco companies abroad? This is a good amendment.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Doggett amendment. We should not use any Federal funds to support the promotion and export of tobacco overseas. Tobacco kills. It is a known killer. It is toxic and addictive. Tobacco kills more than 1,000 Americans every day.

Most people begin smoking when they are teenagers. Every day 3,000 young people begin smoking. We must put an end to this effort. This is an effort we support worldwide. We must send that same message around the world that tobacco kills. We should not, we must not, we cannot support smoking in other countries around the world.

We must not allow public funds to promote smoking in other countries. Why should we export our poison? Why should we send our poison to poorer, sicker, less developed countries? We all live on this planet together, Mr. Chairman. We must be concerned not just about our children becoming addicted, we must also be concerned about children around the world, rich or poor, black, white, yellow, or brown. They all are our children.

We are talking about the lives of innocent children. Mr. Chairman, we have people that are trying to sell poison to our neighbors' children. They are using their money and their ads and their glamour to poison our Nation's and neighbors' children. We have

a moral responsibility not to support this effort. We have a moral duty to protect our neighbors' children just as we protect our own children. We must say no to tobacco both here in our country and around the world.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER], one of the leaders in the effort to deal with the young people and not having them become addicted to nicotine.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment because America's tobacco companies are continuing to profit from addicting the world's children to tobacco.

This amendment will force the U.S. Government to cease the unconscionable practice of assisting these companies in promoting tobacco use abroad. We now have extensive research showing that billboards and advertisements in magazines increase smoking among youth.

The fact that children are being used as advertising targets severely detracts from their ability to make sound judgments about the devastating health consequences of smoking. Let us put emotion aside and simply consider the facts.

In foreign country after foreign country, smoking rates among young people have skyrocketed after American cigarettes were introduced. This is atrocious, and the U.S. Government is in part responsible. We must no longer be part of this tragedy.

I urge my fellow House Members to support this amendment, discourage tobacco use around the world, and send the message that America will not tolerate this kind of assault on the world's children.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, this has been a bipartisan effort. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], one of the coauthors, is not here today to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], my distinguished Republican colleague and another leader in this effort.

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to try to really condense and simply say that I think it is a very important amendment, and I hope that my colleagues will all support it. Tobacco use continues to be a major health problem in our country. We all know that. It is responsible for one out of five illnesses, according to the Centers for Disease Control. We know that those illnesses coming from tobacco cost Medicare more than \$10 billion a year, Medicaid more than \$5 billion.

□ 1015

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand why we are subsidizing the promotion of tobacco products in the first place. The tobacco industry makes large profits on their products, and in fact 68

cents of every dollar that is spent by consumers on tobacco products goes to manufacturers and distributors. Price-Waterhouse conducted a study that concluded that the tobacco industry generates about 800,000 jobs. However, more than 3 million people worldwide die each year from diseases related to tobacco use. That means that four people must die each year to create one job.

The amendment before us is merely an extension of legislative actions taken by past Congresses. In every agriculture appropriations bill since 1993, Congress has approved provisions to prohibit the Agriculture Department from promoting the sale or export of tobacco products overseas. This amendment extends the prohibition to the Departments of Commerce, State, and the U.S. Trade Representative.

We should not be using taxpayer funds to promote the sale or export of cigarettes. This is a product that addicts children and kills one-half of its long-term users. The American Heart Association emphasizes that "more people die each year in the United States from smoking than from AIDS, alcohol, drug use, homicide, car accidents, and fires combined. Tobacco use accounts for more than \$68 billion in health care costs and lost productivity each year."

I think it is time for the Federal Government to get out of the tobacco business. I urge my colleagues to seize this opportunity to move one step more towards accomplishing that goal.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 3¾ minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, my thanks to all of my colleagues who have joined on what I believe is an important amendment. This will be the first time that this Congress, particularly in view of all of the discussion of the tobacco settlement, recognizes and goes on record that our responsibilities as a world leader and as a moral leader in this world do not stop at the shores of this Nation.

Yes, we are concerned that 3,000 young Americans become addicts to tobacco each day; yes, we are concerned that this is the leading cause of preventable death in this country; yes, we are concerned when tobacco companies come through this Congress and sneak in a \$50 billion tax credit for themselves. But our concern does not go just to our children; it goes to the children of the world. And we know that if a tobacco settlement is funded by simply addicting other children we have forfeited our claim to responsibility in this world and our claim to any moral leadership in this world.

And so today, Mr. Chairman, I believe this House will go on record as saying no longer will we use the tax dollars of American taxpayers to promote the sale of tobacco abroad, and no longer will we ask the U.S. Trade Representative, as happened in Korea, to go in and knock down restrictions on

advertising directed at young Koreans, directed at the children of Korea so that they can become addicted to nicotine, and say that we did it because it was a trade regulation that was limiting new entrants, American tobacco companies, into this foreign market. We go on record against that.

There is an amendment that has been added by my colleague from West Virginia, and it is a narrow amendment indeed. It says essentially that if some country were to say we do not want West Virginia tobacco but we will take the tobacco from the rest of the world, that that would be a very narrow limited basis for the Trade Representative to go in and see that that kind of arbitrary discrimination did not occur. But not with reference to health and safety regulations, not with regard to the ingredients in tobacco, as our embassy in Thailand sought to do to limit the health efforts of the Thai Government; no, what we will be doing today is responding to the tobacco control advocates from 19 countries around the world who wrote this Congress this very summer and asked us specifically to provide for an explicit statement that our Trade Representative and our State Department would not be out trying to interfere with the health regulations of other countries around this world who are trying to protect their children from the problem of tobacco just as we are trying to protect ours.

As the New York Times wrote recently, Washington can surely remove tobacco from the category of products that get aggressive support for opening foreign markets. American companies and the American Government unleash sophisticated marketing campaigns that increase smoking and, of course, thereby increase preventable death in many countries where people do not fully understand its danger. That gives Washington a responsibility to undo the damage, and that is precisely what this House would be doing this morning in adopting this amendment.

This amendment has been endorsed by all of the leading public health organizations that have been struggling with the menace of tobacco in this country. The American Lung Association, Dr. C. Everett Koop, President Reagan's Surgeon General, has spoken out with reference to this matter, and I believe we will constructively move forward this morning to adopt an amendment that really for the first time in this Congress goes on record concerning our feelings about the problems of tobacco.

And I hope that we will see this incorporated into the instructions that go to every one of our commercial and economic counselors around the globe, so that they will understand full well that anything they might do on behalf of an American tobacco company has been seriously and narrowly limited to those most arbitrary regulations that have nothing to do with public health and safety. Their job should be, as emissaries for our country, to encourage

other countries to promote health and safety and well-being for their children, and not to promote the sale of a product that is the leading cause of preventable death in this world.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for approval of the amendment, as amended.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Doggett-Meehan amendment because our Government should do everything it can to prevent the use of tobacco products—regardless if that use occurs in the United States or abroad. The amendment before us is simple—it merely prohibits the use of taxpayer dollars to help tobacco companies market their products overseas.

Overseas communities clearly represent the future market for America's tobacco products. Since 1990, the sale of Philip Morris tobacco products have increased in this country by about 5 percent. However, during the same time period, Philip Morris' overseas sales skyrocketed by 80 percent.

Worse still, the new smokers who are attracted to these U.S. tobacco products are children. For example just 2 years after American cigarettes were introduced to Taiwan, smoking rates among Taiwanese teenagers jumped from 22 to 32 percent. In Korea, the number of male teens who smoked almost doubled to 30 percent just 1 year after United States tobacco products entered the market.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, each of us should do everything we can to reduce smoking worldwide—not just in the United States. This is especially true when you consider that it's the kids of the world who are most susceptible to the marketing of this lethal product.

I urge my colleagues to take this small, but worthy step to reduce the world's addiction to tobacco by limiting our country's ability to push tobacco use abroad. I urge you to support the Doggett amendment—let's not spend anymore taxpayer dollars to boost these lethal tobacco products overseas.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, which will take us one more step toward a consistent Federal tobacco policy.

Tobacco products kill over 3 million people every year, including 400,000 Americans. Every day, thousands of young people start smoking. One in three will die from cancer, heart disease, and other illnesses caused by smoking. American taxpayers should not be subsidizing this deadly product.

We in the United States are facing a public health crisis over the effects of tobacco use. In fact, we spend almost \$200 million each year to warn Americans about the dangers of tobacco and prevent its use.

But it is irresponsible fiscal and health policy for the Federal Government to then turn around and promote the sale of tobacco products overseas. What kind of an example are we setting for the rest of the world? What kind of an example are we setting for our own kids here in the United States who are being told not to smoke?

It's time for this hypocrisy to end. We must make our Federal tobacco policy consistent with our public health policy.

Today, we have an opportunity to move another step down the road to dissolving the Federal Government's partnership with the tobacco industry. We must stop using taxpayer dollars to subsidize a product that kills millions of adults, addicts our kids, and costs billions a year in health care.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this attack on farmers. Singling out one legal product is wrong. If this amendment passes, the U.S. Trade Representative will be prevented from using America's influence with foreign countries to eliminate unfair foreign trade barriers imposed on a legal, American product grown by family farmers. One third of the tobacco grown in this country is exported. Foreign markets for American tobacco are vital to small tobacco farmers and their communities. This legislation represents an assault on America's family farmers.

If USTR is no longer allowed to take action against trade barriers imposed on these American products, foreign governments will impose such barriers at will. We would never do this to other legal products such as American automobiles, American computers, American seafood, American beef, or American airplanes. We're fighting to gain access to foreign markets for these products. Not doing so for tobacco is unfair and is bad policy. Congress would not dare do this to any other group of American Producers.

USTR's hands would be tied in negotiating trade deals with countries where tobacco is but one of a host of items considered. A country could ban all American tobacco, a violation of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade. Yet, USTR would be prevented from taking action, even if a clear violation has occurred.

There is nothing to be gained by tying the hands of USTR. This will not prevent people from smoking. Those who choose to smoke will simply buy cigarettes made in countries where tobacco production is not regulated as it is here. Countries where children are paid poverty wages to make cigarettes in horrible working conditions. Countries that do not regulate the use of pesticides. Countries that do not inspect manufacturers for sanitary procedures. This amendment won't reduce smoking. It will only benefit foreign tobacco companies and farmers at the expense of 124,000 American family farmers.

This is the crop insurance vote all over again. This body agreed that singling out one commodity that receives crop insurance would be discriminatory, and defeated an attempt earlier this year to eliminate it for tobacco farmers. This amendment is another unfair attack on hard-working, god-fearing farmers playing by the rules. I urge you to support America's right and responsibility to enforce international agreements and to support American farmers. Vote "no" on this amendment.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Doggett-Meehan-Hansen-DeGette amendment because the Federal Government should not be in the business of assisting the tobacco industry in promoting its deadly and addictive products either in the United States or in other countries.

The U.S. tobacco industry exploits the domestic market by flooding our communities with billboard, magazine and newspaper advertisements and sponsoring concerts and sporting events. They have launched their campaigns with the knowledge of the addictive and deadly effects of tobacco and for years, kept this information from the public. Worse yet, while they knew that tobacco kills, the industry targeted our children and communities

of color by promoting the ubiquitous Joe Camel and exploiting cultural events such as Juneteenth and Cinco de Mayo festivals.

With U.S. sales lagging in the United States, the tobacco industry has turned to foreign markets to launch their high-profile ads where once again, they are targeting teens and women of color in Asia, Africa, Central, South America, the Caribbean, and Eastern Europe. As a result, worldwide use of American tobacco has skyrocketed over the past 10 years. Foreign sales now account for more than half of all sales for Philip Morris and RJ Reynolds.

Due to the thousands of tobacco-related illnesses and deaths that have resulted from the use of tobacco, we are now in the midst of an unprecedented so-called settlement with the tobacco industry. We are finally discussing substantial curtailment of the promotion, advertising, and distribution of tobacco products in the United States. How then can we turn a blind eye and allow the tobacco industry to addict thousands of people in developing nations? How can we in good consciousness allow the U.S. Government to undermine health warning labels, ingredient disclosure laws and tobacco advertising restrictions in developing countries while we simultaneously bolster these provisions in the United States? With the full knowledge of the lethal effects of tobacco use, the Federal Government is no better than the tobacco industry if it encourages and enables tobacco promotion in other countries.

Referring to the present deal with the tobacco company as a global tobacco settlement is cruel and hypocritical if we are going to assist the industry in addicting people in foreign countries. Enabling the tobacco industry to promote tobacco addiction while we curtail its use in the United States is an unconscionable and unacceptable double standard.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important amendment which will send a clear message to the tobacco industry that the U.S. Government will not be an accomplice in promoting tobacco-related illnesses and death overseas.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 610. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any United Nations undertaking when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds (1) that the United Nations undertaking is a peacekeeping mission, (2) that such undertaking will involve United States Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national, and (3) that the President's military

advisors have not submitted to the President a recommendation that such involvement is in the national security interests of the United States and the President has not submitted to the Congress such a recommendation.

SEC. 611. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to provide the following amenities or personal comforts in the Federal prison system—

(1) in-cell television viewing except for prisoners who are segregated from the general prison population for their own safety;

(2) the viewing of R, X, and NC-17 rated movies, through whatever medium presented;

(3) any instruction (live or through broadcasts) or training equipment for boxing, wrestling, judo, karate, or other martial art, or any bodybuilding or weightlifting equipment of any sort;

(4) possession of in-cell coffee pots, hot plates or heating elements; or

(5) the use or possession of any electric or electronic musical instrument.

SEC. 612. None of the funds made available in title II for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) under the heading "Fleet Modernization, Shipbuilding and Conversion" may be used to implement sections 603, 604, and 605 of Public Law 102-567.

SEC. 613. Any costs incurred by a Department or agency funded under this Act resulting from personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this Act shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such Department or agency: *Provided*, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this section is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 614. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Federal Bureau of Prisons may be used to distribute or make available any commercially published information or material to a prisoner when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such information or material is sexually explicit or features nudity.

SEC. 615. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE", not more than ninety percent of the amount to be awarded to an entity under the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant shall be made available to such an entity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the entity that employs a public safety officer (as such term is defined in section 1204 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968) does not provide such a public safety officer who retires or is separated from service due to injury suffered as the direct and proximate result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty while responding to an emergency situation or a hot pursuit (as such terms are defined by State law) with the same or better level of health insurance benefits that are paid by the entity at the time of retirement or separation.

SEC. 616. EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT.—Any Member of Congress and any individual who is paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate shall be entitled to receive a reimbursement for any legal expenses and other legitimate expenses incurred by such Member or indi-

vidual in connection with a Department of Justice prosecution arising from or in connection with the performance of official duties and brought against such Member or individual if such Member or individual is acquitted of the charges brought, the charges are dismissed by a court, or the conviction is reversed on appeal.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments at this point in the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEKSTRA: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 617. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the expenses of an election officer appointed by a court to oversee an election of any officer or trustee for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is it accomplishes an objective that we outlined last week on an earlier appropriations bill. What it does is it prohibits the spending of any additional dollars on the actual paying for the administration of a rerun election by the Teamsters Union. As my colleagues are aware, the Federal Government spent roughly \$20 million in 1995 through 1997 to pay for a Teamsters' election. The efforts of these taxpayer dollars were subverted by individuals within the Teamsters, resulting in the election being thrown out because of illegalities and corruption in that election.

This paid, these dollars paid for the actual printing of ballots, the counting of ballots, the payment of phones, the internal operations of a private organization. It is not the taxpayers' responsibility to incur these costs. It is the Federal Government's responsibility to oversee and ensure that no Federal election laws are violated, that there are no violations. This amendment says we will supervise but we will not pay for the day-to-day operations of a private organization.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This amendment would attempt to validate an agreement entered into by the Justice Department under the Bush administration. We think that the gentleman's approach is

ill considered, that the Bush administration in the 1988 consent decrees require that the Teamsters pay for court supervision of the 1991 election, which cost about \$19 million. We oppose the amendment because we feel that we should have the flexibility to participate and to ensure that the elections are conducted fairly. Granted, that is an imperfect process, but nevertheless, because of the history of these elections and the seriousness of the charges, and they are being repeated here, certainly the Government should have a role in this and through the process of oversight. Obviously if this is knocked out we would not be able to participate in that.

So, Mr. Chairman, we oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, this is not, this amendment does not remove the Federal Government from its proper role of oversight for the activities of private organizations. What this amendment does is it says we will not pay for the transactions that a private organization has to incur on a day-to-day business to fulfill its proper role to run its business.

This is corporate welfare, corporate welfare at its worst, because when the Federal Government in 1996 did reach out and say, "We are going to help you and we're going to pay for your day-to-day operations," people within the Teamsters said, "Thank you very much," and they took this \$20 million and they used it for illegal purposes, not to build their union, not to strengthen their organization, but to begin to destroy it and destroy the confidence at all levels and destroy the public perception of this organization.

Mr. Chairman, this organization has the funds to run its day-to-day operations. The taxpayers should not once again be asked to foot the bill and to run the day-to-day operations. The Federal Government, the Labor Department and the Justice Department have a role and have a responsibility to monitor and supervise those elections, not to pay for the counting of the ballots and the printing of the ballots.

□ 1030

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment, and in fact support its adoption. I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 239, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FOX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 57 offered by Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania:

Page 117, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 617. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended, directly or indirectly, to make any payment to, provide any financial assistance to, or enter into any contract with, the Palestine Broadcasting Corporation, any affiliate or successor agency of such corporation, or any journalist employed by or representing such corporation.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman like to speak on his reservation?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment because it proposes changing existing law, constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to make a point of order, or reserve a point of order at this point?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on behalf of amendment 57. From a merits point of view, the Palestinian Broadcast Corporation, which receives some funds from the United States, speaks out against the United States. But the important point I would like to make is I would like to, in the interest of bipartisanship, be able to delete language from the amendment. The words "any affiliate or successor agency of such corporation or any journalist employed by or representing such corporation," I would like to delete that language by unanimous consent.

If those in charge of both sides of the aisle would agree to that change, I would be very grateful, so the point of order which could be made would be cured. I would be very grateful if that could be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX]?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that considering we are on the Justice-Commerce appropriation, the idea of having free speech move forward in this Chamber and not have a technicality rule over substance, I would appreciate it if both sides of the aisle would consider the possibility of the unanimous-consent request and deleting the language.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, a couple of things for my good friend from Pennsylvania, who I was very pleased to work with on the Legal Services amendment this year and last year, and I did not do this lightly, and I would love to be able to accommodate the gentleman.

First of all, when we are talking about free speech, the underlying issue here really is associated with free speech in USIA funding, the ability of groups in the Middle East to market their views and opinions. The gentleman's amendment would cut that off. We can argue about the content of that speech, but I think the gentleman's amendment cuts it off regardless of the content.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, to make the clarification, the fact is this is not free speech, the United States is paying for it, and the Palestinian Broadcast Corporation is calling for the annihilation of the United States. I do not think we should fund agencies that call for the destruction of the United States and the destruction of other countries, including Israel. So it is not free speech, we are paying for it.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, without debating that issue further, we are also operating under a very constrained unanimous-consent agreement here, and I think that it would set a bad precedent with some of these amendments that are coming up if we were to allow for them to be amended.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, reclaiming my time, the fact is the momentary seconds in this Chamber to allow the curative deletion would allow the Members to vote on the motion, and then your persuasive, thoughtful arguments could win the day on the merits.

I believe it is not in the interests and the spirit of this body, nor this committee that has done such good work, to disallow this unanimous consent for the purpose of stifling debate and stifling the Members' ability to speak out for or against or vote for or against.

So I would ask the ranking member to reconsider his original consideration of my request in the hopes that with comity and cooperation, we could move on and go to the merits of the matter.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia insist on his point of order?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part "no amendment to a general appropriation bill shall be in order if changing existing" law. This amendment gives affirmative direction in effect, imposes additional duties, and modifies existing powers and duties.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] wish to be heard?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe, with all due respect to my good friend from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], with whom I have had an opportunity to work on Legal Services, and I am grateful, in this particular instance I do not believe this is legislating in an appropriation bill.

The fact of the matter is we are saying no funds can go to the Palestinian Broadcast Corporation. Whether or not it talks about a successor agency does not put new duties, in my opinion, on anyone. It is surplussage language. It does not actually give new duties, nor does it violate the spirit or intent of the purpose of such restrictions that are normally placed.

I do appreciate, Mr. Chairman, when there are new duties placed in legislation. I do not believe this is such a case. Therefore, I would respectfully request that the Chair find in favor of the amendment moving forward as is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is in the form of a limitation. The amendment seeks to deny funds for payments to, financial assistance for, or the entering into contracts with, the Palestinian Broadcast Corporation, or any affiliate or successor agency to the Palestinian Broadcast Corporation, or any journalist employed by or representing such corporation.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 52, even though amendment in the form of a negative restriction on funds in a bill might refrain from explicitly assigning new duties to officers of the government, if the putative limitation implicitly requires them to make investigations, compile evidence, or make judgments and determinations not otherwise required of them by law, then it assumes the character of legislation

and is subject to a point of order under clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The proponent of a limitation assumes the burden of proving that any duties imposed by the provision are merely ministerial or are already required by law.

The Chair in this instance must focus on the requirement in the amendment that the officials who administer the funds in question must determine what a "successor agency" to the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation may be. Absent a showing that those officials are already charged with that responsibility or possessed of that information, the Chair must conclude that the amendment would impose a new duty on such officials.

Accordingly, the Chair rules that the amendment changes existing law, is not in the form of a proper limitation and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appeal the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

The decision of the Chair was sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 61 offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

Page 117, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 627. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated to carry out this Act shall be used to deport or remove from the United States any alien who was provided by the Immigration and Naturalization Service one of the following identification numbers:

A76553660.
A76553650.
A76553651.
A76553661.
A76553858.
A76553862.
A76553863.
A76553876.
A76553877.
A76553665.
A76553659.
A76553658.
A76553679.
A76553678.
A76553681.
A76553654.
A74553078.
A74553079.
A74553077.
A76553683.
A76553674.
A76553652.
A76553692.
A76553649.
A76553673.
A76183163.
A76183162.
A76553653.
A76553686.
A76553688.
A76553664.
A76553871.
A76553888.
A76553684.

A76553887.
A76553657.
A76553672.
A76553685.
A76553655.
A76553688.
A76553667.
A76553682.
A76553680.
A74553085.
A74553076.
A76553690.
A76553691.
A76553698.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, September 25, 1997, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, right now there are people who are working 18 to 20 hours a day under threat of beatings and torture. One might think I am describing a Third World country, but I am not. Right now these crimes are repeated in virtually every major city in this country. Why? Because the victims of these crimes are undocumented immigrants and their tormentors are using fear to silence them.

Last July a group of disabled Mexican immigrants were discovered living in squalor in my district. They had been taken from their villages in Mexico, smuggled into this country, and forced to work to up to 18 hours a day. If they did not earn enough money, they were beaten.

In this case, the victims could not bear their terrible treatment any longer. Knowing that they might be separated from their children and that they might be put up in jail, they still went to the police. These are brave people who exposed a terrible crime. Yet how are they treated? For the past 2 months they have been held in a motel in Queens while immigration officials decide their fate.

I am offering an amendment today that will bar the Immigration and Naturalization Service from using its funds to deport the victims of these terrible crimes.

Let me be perfectly clear: These people were brought to this country, they were tortured and beaten, they were enslaved because their abusers thought their victims would keep silent out of fear of reprisals. My amendment will put this Nation on notice that we will no longer tolerate the abuse of the vulnerable.

If this amendment fails to pass, what message is this Congress sending to the country? That you can smuggle people into this country, enslave them, beat them, make a fortune with their labor, and you know if they turn you in, they will be deported?

What a great deal for the owners of sweatshops. What a terrible deal for

the victims. Is this how we should treat these people who lived through hell, and helped us uncover this awful crime? Shall we send them packing, or shall we show mercy?

My amendment is an act of compassion on behalf of a group of people who have been through hell.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Who rises in opposition?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I state that I am in opposition only in a very technical sense in order to be able to speak to the gentlewoman's concerns.

Let me say first off that the gentlewoman has raised a very troublesome matter to all of us. I think every person in this country, especially in this Congress, sympathizes with the plight of the people that the gentlewoman has mentioned, and want to be of help. We are trying to be of help.

I have discussed the matter with the gentlewoman before the amendment was offered and have pledged to her my assistance in every aspect that we can think of, and that of my colleagues, in helping her and the others, to help these people.

Under the present law, the Attorney General of the United States has certain prerogatives to intervene in this case and to prevent deportation and to help in any number of ways.

The current law provides the Attorney General with authority to withhold deportation for humanitarian purposes and other circumstances.

□ 1045

There are other remedies under current law that can be exercised for granting visas for witnesses, for example, who have information of critical value to the U.S. law enforcement officials, and this matter is under investigation, obviously, for perhaps criminal activity, among other things.

So I pledge to the gentlewoman that we will all assist her in the effort to relieve the plight of these people.

However, the gentlewoman's amendment on an appropriations bill would be unprecedented. We have never done what the gentlewoman is asking the Congress to do here, and I think it would set a terrible precedent for us to intervene in a particular individual's problem with the bureaucracy, before the bureaucracy has a chance to deal with it.

So I would hope at the conclusion of our discussion, the gentlewoman might withdraw the amendment so that we can then proceed to help her administratively in the matter.

We will ask the Department of Justice and the INS, about the custody and care of these people, any plans that

are being discussed that may involve deportation, any options that they are talking about to provide relief from deportation based on the authorities already available to the Attorney General, and I pledge that we will work with the gentlewoman in a vigorous way.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the gentleman's help. I would share with the gentleman that these people live right now in total limbo, that they have exhausted every mechanism. I have called on the Attorney General, and she has yet to act on this case. So I would appreciate that the chairman and the ranking member from our side will work with us, with me, to make sure that a positive and constructive resolution is granted based on a humanitarian act. We have to show compassion, and I know that it will set a precedent, but this is the only mechanism that right now I have before me before the end of this session.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman for bringing the matter to the attention of the Congress and the country. She is to be highly commended for that, and it is too bad that the gentlewoman has had to resort to an extraordinary procedure here in order to gain the attention. I hope, of the Attorney General and the staff of the Justice Department and INS on trying to gain some relief for these people, and I pledge to the gentlewoman that we will help you in that regard.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to associate myself with the gentleman's sentiments. This is an extraordinary situation, and I commend the gentlewoman and her colleague from New York for bringing this issue to the Congress. We do understand how hard the gentlewoman has worked to bring it to the attention of the administration, and we are a bit chagrined to see that there has not been the kind of responsiveness that would be merited in the circumstances. I think the proposal that the gentlewoman has worked out with the Chairman is one that will get attention, and at the same time not create the kind of unsatisfactory precedent that the chairman is concerned with.

I join the chairman in assuring the gentlewoman that we will do everything necessary and everything in our power to make sure that the gentlewoman does get responsiveness from the appropriate authorities.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there is one other option that the gentlewoman and I have discussed. If the Attorney General

and the administration does not take appropriate action in the immediate future before we go to conference with the Senate on this bill, there is always the option of the conferees on this bill with the House and Senate, taking further action in respect to the matter.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON], my colleague in whose district some of the victims live.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING], my friends and colleagues.

Most of my colleagues probably are already aware of the tragic case of some 57 hearing-impaired Mexican immigrants smuggled into this country illegally and held in involuntary servitude, if you will. This was brought to light through the national media on July 20 of this year.

Mr. Chairman, these unfortunate individuals had been put up in two apartment buildings in Queens, New York, one located in my congressional district and one in Representative VELÁZQUEZ's district. They were forced to live in inadequate housing and to panhandle by selling trinkets on the streets and subways of New York.

In addition to being hearing-impaired, they knew only the Spanish language and had no means to readily communicate with anyone to tell them of their plight. They were simply at the mercy of their so-called employers.

Thanks to the good efforts of the New York City Police Department, in particular Officers Phil Rogan and Billy Milan of the 115th Precinct, these individuals were freed from the control of their unscrupulous masters. Sadly, their ordeal did not end there as they face potential deportation in the near future if the Velázquez-Schumer-King amendment is not passed.

Mr. Chairman, it has been over 2 months since this situation came to light, yet the status of these immigrants remains in limbo as they await a decision by the Federal Government while being held in a local motel.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from West Virginia for their compassion, and we look forward to working with them to resolve this matter.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I will now withdraw my amendment, and I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member, and I look forward to working together to bring some peace to these victims.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 239, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which

further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 33 offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN];

Amendment Nos. 2 and 3 en bloc offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT]; Amendment No. 36 offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN:

Page 67, line 19, insert before the period the following: *Provided*, That, of such amount, not more than \$356,242,740 shall be available for obligation until the Secretary of State has made one or more designations of organizations as foreign terrorist organizations pursuant to section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)), as added by section 302 of Public Law 104-132 (110 Stat. 1214, 1248).

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 6, answered “present” 5, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

AYES—396

Abercrombie	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Ackerman	Bryant	Davis (VA)
Aderholt	Bunning	Deal
Allen	Burr	DeFazio
Andrews	Burton	DeGette
Archer	Callahan	Delahunt
Army	Calvert	DeLauro
Bachus	Camp	DeLay
Baesler	Campbell	Deutsch
Baker	Canady	Diaz-Balart
Baldacci	Cannon	Dickey
Ballenger	Capps	Dingell
Barcia	Cardin	Dixon
Barr	Carson	Doggett
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Dooley
Barrett (WI)	Chabot	Doolittle
Bartlett	Chambliss	Doyle
Barton	Chenoweth	Dreier
Bass	Christensen	Duncan
Bateman	Clay	Dunn
Becerra	Clayton	Edwards
Bereuter	Clement	Ehlers
Berry	Clyburn	Ehrlich
Bilbray	Coble	Emerson
Bilirakis	Coburn	Engel
Bishop	Combest	English
Blagojevich	Condit	Ensign
Bliley	Cook	Eshoo
Blumenauer	Cooksey	Etheridge
Blunt	Costello	Evans
Boehlert	Cox	Everett
Boehner	Coyne	Ewing
Bono	Cramer	Farr
Borski	Crane	Fattah
Boswell	Crapo	Fawell
Boucher	Cubin	Fazio
Boyd	Cummings	Filner
Brady	Cunningham	Flake
Brown (CA)	Danner	Foglietta
Brown (FL)	Davis (FL)	Foley

Forbes	Linder	Rothman
Ford	Lipinski	Roukema
Fowler	Livingston	Roybal-Allard
Fox	LoBiondo	Royce
Frank (MA)	Lofgren	Rush
Franks (NJ)	Lowe	Ryun
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Sabo
Frost	Luther	Salmon
Furse	Maloney (CT)	Sanchez
Galleghy	Maloney (NY)	Sanders
Ganske	Manton	Sandlin
Gejdenson	Manzullo	Sanford
Gekas	Markey	Sawyer
Gephardt	Martinez	Saxton
Gilchrist	Mascara	Scarborough
Gillmor	Matsui	Schaefer, Dan
Gilman	McCarthy (MO)	Schaffer, Bob
Goode	McCarthy (NY)	Scott
Goodlatte	McCollum	Sensenbrenner
Goodling	McCrery	Serrano
Gordon	McDade	Sessions
Goss	McDermott	Shadeegg
Graham	McGovern	Shaw
Granger	McHale	Shays
Green	McHugh	Sherman
Greenwood	McIntosh	Shimkus
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Shuster
Gutknecht	McKeon	Sisisky
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Skaggs
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Skeen
Hamilton	Menendez	Skelton
Hastert	Metcalfe	Slaughter
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (MI)
Hayworth	Millender-McDonald	Smith (NJ)
Hefley	Miller (FL)	Smith (OR)
Hefner	Mink	Smith (TX)
Herger	Moakley	Smith, Adam
Hill	Mollohan	Smith, Linda
Hilleary	Moran (KS)	Snowbarger
Hilliard	Morella	Snyder
Hinchey	Murtha	Solomon
Hinojosa	Myrick	Souder
Hobson	Nadler	Spence
Hoekstra	Neal	Stabenow
Holden	Nethercutt	Stark
Hooley	Neumann	Stearns
Horn	Ney	Stenholm
Hostettler	Northup	Stokes
Houghton	Norwood	Strickland
Hoyer	Nussle	Stump
Hulshof	Oberstar	Stupak
Hunter	Obey	Sununu
Hutchinson	Oliver	Talent
Hyde	Ortiz	Tanner
Inglis	Oxley	Tauscher
Istook	Packard	Tauzin
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Jefferson	Pappas	Thomas
Jenkins	Parker	Thompson
John	Pascrell	Thornberry
Johnson (CT)	Pastor	Thune
Johnson, Sam	Paxon	Thurman
Jones	Payne	Tierney
Kanjorski	Pease	Torres
Kaptur	Pelosi	Towns
Kasich	Peterson (MN)	Trafficant
Kelly	Peterson (PA)	Turner
Kennedy (MA)	Petri	Upton
Kennelly	Pickering	Velazquez
Kildee	Pickett	Vento
Kilpatrick	Pitts	Visclosky
Kim	Pombo	Walsh
Kind (WI)	Pomeroy	Wamp
King (NY)	Porter	Watkins
Kingston	Poshard	Watt (NC)
Klecza	Price (NC)	Watts (OK)
Klink	Pryce (OH)	Waxman
Klug	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
Knollenberg	Ramstad	Weldon (PA)
Kolbe	Rangel	Weller
LaFalce	Redmond	Wexler
LaHood	Regula	White
Lampson	Riggs	Whitfield
Lantos	Riley	Wicker
Largent	Rivers	Wise
Latham	Rodriguez	Wolf
LaTourette	Roemer	Woolsey
Leach	Rogan	Wynn
Levin	Rogers	Yates
Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
Lewis (KY)		

NOES—6

Dellums	Miller (CA)
McKinney	Minge

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—5

Bonior	Kucinich	Waters
Johnson, E. B.	Moran (VA)	

NOT VOTING—26

Bentsen	Hansen	Owens
Berman	Harman	Quinn
Bonilla	Hastings (FL)	Reyes
Buyer	Jackson-Lee	Schiff
Collins	(TX)	Schumer
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Spratt
Dicks	Lazio	Taylor (NC)
Gibbons	McInnis	Tiahrt
Gonzalez	Meek	Weygand

□ 1111

Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. DELLUMS changed their vote from “aye” to “no”.

Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. WATT of North Carolina changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

Mr. KUCINICH changed his vote from “aye” to “present.”

Mr. PAUL changed his vote from “present” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 239, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time in which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT OF MARYLAND

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

Amendment No. 2: In title IV relating to “DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES”, in the item relating to “International Organizations and Conferences—contributions to international organizations” strike “of which not to exceed \$54,000,000 shall remain available until expended for payment of arrearages” and all that follows through the second proviso.

Amendment No. 3: In title IV relating to “DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES”, in the item relating to “International Organizations and Conferences—contributions to international peacekeeping activities” strike “of which not to exceed \$46,000,000 shall remain available until expended for payment of arrearages” and all that follows through the first proviso.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 242, not voting 26, as follows:

Paul
Rahall

[Roll No. 458]

AYES—165

Aderholt	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Archer	Goode	Pickering
Armey	Goodlatte	Pitts
Bachus	Goodling	Pombo
Baker	Goss	Portman
Barcia	Granger	Radanovich
Barr	Gutknecht	Redmond
Barrett (NE)	Hall (TX)	Riggs
Bartlett	Hastert	Riley
Barton	Hastings (WA)	Rogan
Bilbray	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Bilirakis	Hefley	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Hergert	Royce
Boehner	Hill	Ryun
Bono	Hilleary	Salmon
Brady	Hobson	Sanford
Bryant	Hoekstra	Scarborough
Bunning	Hulshof	Schaefer, Dan
Burr	Hunter	Schaffer, Bob
Burton	Hutchinson	Sensenbrenner
Callahan	Inglis	Sessions
Calvert	Istook	Shadegg
Camp	Jenkins	Shaw
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Shimkus
Cannon	Jones	Shuster
Chabot	Kim	Skeen
Chambliss	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Chenoweth	Klug	Smith (OR)
Christensen	Largent	Smith (TX)
Coble	Lewis (KY)	Smith, Linda
Coburn	Linder	Snowbarger
Combest	LoBiondo	Solomon
Cook	Lucas	Souder
Cooksey	Manzullo	Spence
Cox	McCollum	Stearns
Crane	McCrery	Stenholm
Crapo	McDade	Stump
Cubin	McIntosh	Sununu
Cunningham	McIntyre	Talent
Danner	McKeon	Tauzin
Deal	Metcalf	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Mica	Thornberry
Dickey	Miller (FL)	Thune
Doolittle	Moran (KS)	Trafficant
Dreier	Myrick	Upton
Duncan	Nethercutt	Wamp
Dunn	Neumann	Watkins
Ehrlich	Ney	Watts (OK)
Emerson	Northup	Weldon (FL)
English	Norwood	Weller
Ensign	Nussle	White
Everett	Pappas	Whitfield
Ewing	Paul	Wicker
Foley	Paxon	Wolf
Fowler	Pease	Young (FL)

NOES—242

Abercrombie	Cramer	Ganske
Ackerman	Cummings	Gejdenson
Allen	Davis (FL)	Gekas
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Gephardt
Baesler	Davis (VA)	Gilchrest
Baldacci	DeFazio	Gilman
Ballenger	DeGette	Gordon
Barrett (WI)	Delahunt	Graham
Bass	DeLauro	Green
Bateman	Dellums	Greenwood
Becerra	Deutsch	Gutierrez
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart	Hall (OH)
Berry	Dingell	Hamilton
Bishop	Dixon	Hefner
Blagojevich	Doggett	Hilliard
Bliley	Dooley	Hinche
Blumenauer	Doyle	Hinojosa
Boehlert	Edwards	Holden
Bonior	Ehlers	Hooley
Borski	Engel	Horn
Boswell	Eshoo	Houghton
Boucher	Etheridge	Hoyer
Boyd	Evans	Hyde
Brown (CA)	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Jefferson
Brown (OH)	Fawell	John
Campbell	Fazio	Johnson (CT)
Capps	Filner	Johnson (WI)
Cardin	Flake	Johnson, E. B.
Carson	Foglietta	Kanjorski
Castle	Forbes	Kaptur
Clay	Ford	Kasich
Clayton	Fox	Kelly
Clement	Frank (MA)	Kennedy (MA)
Clyburn	Franks (NJ)	Kennelly
Condit	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Conyers	Frost	Kilpatrick
Costello	Furse	Kind (WI)
Coyne	Galleghy	King (NY)

Klecza	Moakley	Sandlin
Klink	Mollohan	Sawyer
Knollenberg	Moran (VA)	Saxton
Kolbe	Morella	Scott
Kucinich	Murtha	Serrano
LaFalce	Nadler	Shays
LaHood	Neal	Sherman
Lampson	Oberstar	Sisisky
Lantos	Obey	Skaggs
Latham	Olver	Skelton
LaTourette	Ortiz	Slaughter
Leach	Oxley	Smith (NJ)
Levin	Packard	Smith, Adam
Lewis (CA)	Pallone	Snyder
Lewis (GA)	Parker	Stabenow
Lipinski	Pascrell	Stark
Livingston	Pastor	Stokes
Lofgren	Payne	Strickland
Lowe	Pelosi	Stupak
Luther	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Maloney (CT)	Petri	Tauscher
Maloney (NY)	Pickett	Thomas
Manton	Pomeroy	Thompson
Markey	Porter	Thurman
Martinez	Poshard	Tierney
Mascara	Price (NC)	Torres
Matsui	Pryce (OH)	Towns
McCarthy (MO)	Rahall	Turner
McCarthy (NY)	Ramstad	Velazquez
McDermott	Rangel	Vento
McGovern	Regula	Visclosky
McHale	Rivers	Walsh
McHugh	Rodriguez	Waters
McKinney	Roemer	Watt (NC)
McNulty	Rogers	Waxman
Meehan	Rothman	Weldon (PA)
Menendez	Roukema	Wexler
Millender-McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Wise
Miller (CA)	Rush	Woolsey
Minge	Sabo	Wynn
Mink	Sanchez	Yates
	Sanders	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—26

Bentsen	Harman	Owens
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Quinn
Bonilla	Hostettler	Reyes
Buyer	Jackson-Lee	Schiff
Collins	(TX)	Schumer
Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Spratt
Gibbons	Lazio	Taylor (NC)
Gonzalez	McInnis	Tiahrt
Hansen	Meek	Weygand

□ 1121

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Collins for, with Mr. Quinn against.

Mr. Gibbons for, with Ms. Harman against.

Mr. EWING changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 189, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—213

Aderholt	Gekas	Paul
Archer	Gilchrest	Paxon
Armey	Gillmor	Pease
Bachus	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Baker	Goodlatte	Petri
Ballenger	Goodling	Pickering
Barr	Gordon	Pitts
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Pombo
Bartlett	Graham	Pomeroy
Barton	Granger	Porter
Bass	Greenwood	Portman
Bateman	Gutknecht	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Berry	Hastert	Ramstad
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Redmond
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Regula
Bliley	Hefley	Riggs
Blunt	Hergert	Riley
Boehner	Hill	Rogan
Bono	Hilleary	Rogers
Boyd	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Brady	Hoekstra	Roukema
Bryant	Horn	Royce
Bunning	Hostettler	Ryun
Burr	Hulshof	Salmon
Callahan	Hunter	Sanford
Calvert	Hutchinson	Saxton
Camp	Hyde	Scarborough
Campbell	Inglis	Schaefer, Dan
Canady	Istook	Schaffer, Bob
Cannon	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Castle	John	Sessions
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Chenoweth	Jones	Shays
Christensen	Kasich	Shimkus
Coble	Kelly	Shuster
Coburn	Kim	Skeen
Combest	Kingston	Skelton
Condit	Klug	Smith (MI)
Cook	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	Kolbe	Smith (OR)
Cox	Largent	Smith (TX)
Crane	Latham	Smith, Linda
Crapo	LaTourette	Snowbarger
Cubin	Leach	Souder
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Deal	Linder	Stenholm
DeLay	Livingston	Stump
Dickey	LoBiondo	Sununu
Doggett	Lucas	Talent
Doolittle	McCollum	Tanner
Dreier	McCrery	Tauzin
Duncan	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McIntyre	Thomas
Edwards	McKeon	Thornberry
Ehlers	Mica	Thune
Ehrlich	Miller (FL)	Trafficant
Emerson	Moran (KS)	Turner
Ensign	Myrick	Upton
Everett	Nethercutt	Walsh
Ewing	Neumann	Wamp
Fawell	Ney	Watkins
Foley	Northup	Watts (OK)
Fowler	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Franks (NJ)	Nussle	White
Frelinghuysen	Oxley	Whitfield
Frost	Packard	Wicker
Galleghy	Pappas	Wolf
Ganske	Parker	Young (FL)

NOES—189

Abercrombie	Clayton	English
Ackerman	Clement	Eshoo
Allen	Clyburn	Etheridge
Andrews	Conyers	Evans
Baesler	Costello	Farr
Baldacci	Coyne	Fattah
Barcia	Cramer	Fazio
Barrett (WI)	Cummings	Filner
Becerra	Danner	Flake
Bishop	Davis (FL)	Foglietta
Blagojevich	Davis (IL)	Forbes
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Ford
Boehlert	DeGette	Fox
Bonior	Delahunt	Frank (MA)
Borski	DeLauro	Furse
Boswell	Dellums	Gejdenson
Boucher	Deutsch	Gephardt
Brown (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Gilman
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Green
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Gutierrez
Cardin	Dooley	Hall (OH)
Carson	Doyle	Hamilton
Clay	Engel	Hefner

Hilliard	McDade	Rothman
Hinchey	McDermott	Roybal-Allard
Hinojosa	McGovern	Rush
Holden	McHale	Sabo
Hooley	McHugh	Sanchez
Houghton	McKinney	Sanders
Hoyer	McNulty	Sandlin
Jackson (IL)	Meehan	Sawyer
Jefferson	Menendez	Scott
Johnson (WI)	Metcalf	Serrano
Johnson, E. B.	Millender-	Sherman
Kanjorski	McDonald	Sisisky
Kaptur	Miller (CA)	Skaggs
Kennedy (MA)	Minge	Slaughter
Kennelly	Mink	Smith, Adam
Kildee	Moakley	Snyder
Kilpatrick	Mollohan	Stabenow
Kind (WI)	Moran (VA)	Stark
King (NY)	Morella	Stokes
Klecza	Murtha	Stupak
Klink	Nadler	Tauscher
Kucinich	Neal	Thompson
LaFalce	Oberstar	Thurman
LaHood	Obey	Tierney
Lampson	Olver	Torres
Lantos	Ortiz	Towns
Levin	Pallone	Velazquez
Lewis (GA)	Pascarell	Vento
Lipinski	Pastor	Visclosky
Lofgren	Payne	Waters
Lowey	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
Luther	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Maloney (CT)	Pickett	Weldon (PA)
Maloney (NY)	Poshard	Weller
Manton	Price (NC)	Wexler
Markey	Rahall	Wise
Martinez	Rangel	Woolsey
Mascara	Rivers	Wynn
Matsui	Rodriguez	Yates
McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	
McCarthy (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	

NOT VOTING—31

Bentsen	Harman	Reyes
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Schiff
Bonilla	Jackson-Lee	Schumer
Burton	(TX)	Solomon
Buyer	Kennedy (RI)	Spratt
Capps	Lazio	Strickland
Collins	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Dicks	McInnis	Tiahrt
Gibbons	Meek	Weygand
Gonzalez	Owens	Young (AK)
Hansen	Quinn	

□ 1130

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Collins for, with Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas against.

□ 1130

Mr. LUTHER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 459 I inserted my card in a voting station and voted "aye". A green light appeared next to my name. However, I am officially listed as not having voted. I want to indicate for the RECORD that I supported the Hoekstra amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words as the designee of the manager.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage a four-way colloquy with the chairman and two colleagues from adjacent districts, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], regarding problems with the smuggling of illegal aliens in Nebraska and Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, Nebraska and Iowa are major destinations for illegal aliens and alien smugglers due to ex-

tremely low unemployment rates, the number of meat-packing plants, and other labor-intensive industries, and due to the fact that two major interstate highways which cross the States, I-80 and I-29, are serving as what seems to be considered a low-risk corridor for smuggling aliens to other parts of our Nation.

The Omaha INS office, which serves both States, could not respond to approximately 55 possible instances of alien smuggling, including 382 suspected illegal aliens in Nebraska and Iowa, because the INS did not allocate additional resources to respond.

The INS Omaha District Office has a small staff when compared with nearby district offices. Additionally, it does not have a much needed antismuggling unit, in contrast to other interior INS districts in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, do you agree that INS should allocate additional agents as part of an antismuggling unit to the Omaha District Office to fight the smuggling of illegal aliens into and through Nebraska and Omaha?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. I am aware of the problems with alien smuggling in Nebraska and Iowa that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has raised. It is for that very reason that the House report includes language directing INS to review the requirements of State and localities in the central and western region of the country when allocating additional personnel to apprehend, detain, and remove illegal aliens.

I will continue to work with my colleague to find a solution to the problem during our consultations with INS on personnel deployment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for yielding.

I would like to also, Mr. Chairman, take this opportunity to express my continued concern about the rather regular occurrence of alien smuggling in and through Nebraska, particularly along I-80, and I concur with the request of my colleague for an anti-smuggling unit in the Omaha INS District Office.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] so much. It has happened in his own district.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for yielding.

I have followed with great interest the concerns of my colleagues from Ne-

braska because my home State of Iowa shares many of the same problems.

As a member of the appropriations subcommittee which funds INS and other Department of Justice agencies, I recognize the budgetary constraints and limitations that face our law enforcement agencies. During the debate on the immigration reform bill last year, I successfully offered an amendment mandating the INS coordinate its activities with local and State agencies. This cooperation of local, State, and Federal agents will bring efficient and thorough protection to our urban and rural areas, especially in States with few INS officers.

I want to highlight also the work of the Tri-State Drug Task Force, headquartered in Sioux City, IA, as an example of effective coordination. The task force has worked tirelessly to stem the flow of illegal drugs to Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota by coordinating local police, sheriffs' offices, and Federal agents from the INS, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and the Marshal's Service.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this Member thanks his distinguished colleagues and especially the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the chairman, for this colloquy with my two colleagues and I. I thank him for participating in the colloquy.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 54 offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 117, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 617. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to pay the salary or expenses of any official or employee of the Department of State to make or carry out any contract authorizing any private entity to assess a charge or fee upon United States citizens for information about United States passports.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, September 25, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This amendment is very simple. It is intended to stop the State Department from charging Americans twice for the same service.

The State Department has begun charging, as I think many of my colleagues know now, U.S. citizens \$1.05 per minute for information about their U.S. passports. In order to get this information, they must call a 900 number that is run by a for-profit corporation. Americans who have already paid a \$65 passport fee are now required to pay

for information that used to be available for free.

Something, it seems to me, is very wrong with this picture, especially because passport applicants are already paying for more passport services than they are receiving. Let us face it, whether we think it is deserved or not, 900 telephone numbers carry certain connotations with the American public, from the racy to the ridiculous. That forum should not be used to sell information that should already belong to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the idea behind a user fee such as the passport fee is that we are paying for what it actually costs the Government to provide us that service. The user fees should not be used for a profit engine, and passport applicants are supposed to get what they pay for. But the \$65 fee that U.S. citizens pay up front for passport processing already more than covers the cost of passport services that they receive from the State Department.

A while back, the Department conducted a fee study to justify the latest increase in the passport fee to \$65. But the study, in fact, did not justify that amount. The Department did its best to attribute every possible cost to passport users. It even went so far to factor in the proportional cost of U.S. overseas consular services which might be used by American travelers. But even then, the total was nothing close to \$65. The Department has been at a loss to know what to do in response to that finding, so they have not released it to the public.

Let me say again, this is a kind of double taxation. We have had numerous complaints in my State, particularly in my counties of Monmouth, Ocean, Mercer, and Burlington. As a matter of fact, the county clerk in Ocean County was the one who brought this to my attention some time ago. So this is in response to that criticism of the people from those counties.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that is under consideration in the conference on the State Department authorization bill that has migrated onto this bill.

I understand that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is opposed to the notion that people should have to pay for a telephone call to obtain information on passport applications. The problem was that the State Department did not have the personnel to be able to provide information, and that this was a way to try to improve service in exchange for a small charge.

While I am willing to accept the Smith amendment, I believe there are many unanswered questions about the amendment. If the 1-900 number is banned on October 1, as the amendment would require, things will revert to the way they were before, where the service level was unsatisfactory. There

is a contractor providing the 1-900 service, and if the contract is cut off, these people will be laid off, and there could be termination costs.

The State Department indicates that if they have to switch to a different manner of providing service, such as a 1-800 number, assuming money is available to pay for that service, a contract would have to be recompeted, and it could take months before a contract could be awarded and a new service instituted.

So in the short term, this amendment has the possibility of decreasing the availability of information to people trying to track their passport applications. So I am not convinced that the amendment is the final answer on the issue.

But we are willing to work with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and take the issue into conference and see if we can work out a solution that will adequately address the situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for accepting the amendment.

Let me say clearly, the effective date is open to movement, and the date of enactment does not have to be necessarily the effective date, so that there is a transition.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for his understanding and cooperation on this issue and the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], as well as the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the ranking member.

The American people and, I think, the Members of the House should just roughly understand what is happening here. The State Department decided that they were upset because we did not fully fund everything that they were asking for. So they decided to come up with their own tax on the American people and say, well, we do not have enough money to answer the phones, so we will just contract and let somebody else perform that duty.

It is almost as if we decided that we were upset that we did not get enough money for our legislative offices and said, "Let us not answer the phones. Let us get a company to answer the phones for us, and it is a 900 number, and they will tell what we are in favor of or not in favor of and free up our staff to do something else." It is kind of outrageous.

I just want to raise the ante from what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said. It is not double, it is triple taxation. They pay taxes on the 15th of April.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the

time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1145

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is basically a triple taxation. We pay taxes on the 15th of April; then there is a user fee which is a tax of \$65 on the American people in order to get the passport, so that will tax twice. Then they decide that that is not good enough, we are going to tax people for the information, like going to the grocery store and ask the grocer where the milk is, and he says, "Ask that guy, but he's going to charge you to tell you where the milk is." I mean it is an absolute absurdity.

There is a solution, and I appreciate the suggestion, and it is certainly a good one. An additional suggestion would be to dedicate the \$65 fee to the State Department to allow them to use that money rather than putting that money back into the general fund. But triple taxing the American people for basic government information, basic service to which they are entitled, is an absolute absurdity, and I salute the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the complaints that we have been getting are very much like what the gentleman is talking about. If people called my office and the gentleman's office and other Members' offices seeking basic information about that case that we have under consideration with the IRS or any other Federal bureaucracy, it would be absurd to charge them for that phone call, and that is what this is all about. And let me reiterate again to the Members that the \$65 for the passport more than covers. There is a profit there for the State Department, regrettably; it ought to be lower, it should accommodate what does the service cost, and then that is what the cost should be.

So this amendment seeks to do what the IRS and nobody else could even think of doing; that is, having a 900 number to give basic information. We are in the service business. We ought to enhance that service, and an 800 number would do that job, and that is what we are hoping will come out of this.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely correct.

We have a case of a nun who lived in my district. She had been adopted, had a different name in her adulthood, was selected by her order to represent them overseas and had to get a passport. She had to call this 900 number. She got trapped in this system. They did not know how to fix this thing. She was spending \$60 calling 900 numbers. Everybody was looking at her kind of crookedly in her convent, as my colleagues know, why is she on this 900

number all night, and the deal was she was the nun who could not fly. They could not fix this for her.

Mr. Chairman, certainly she is entitled to basic government services as every other U.S. citizen is without being taxed three times, and I appreciate the cooperation of gentleman from New Jersey and the chairman and ranking member on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. KLECZKA

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 58 offered by Mr. KLECZKA: Page 117, after line 2, insert the following: SEC. 617. None of the funds appropriated to carry out this Act may be used to purchase or install live fingerprint scanners in Immigration and Naturalization Service field offices or card scanners at Immigration and Naturalization Service centers unless the Immigration and Naturalization Service refunds, not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, all fees paid to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for designated fingerprinting service certification under 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(e).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, September 25, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] reserves a point of order, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the point of order that has been raised. I will not pursue the amendment, I will withdraw it at a later time, but I would like to establish for the record the situation that the amendment seeks to address.

Mr. Chairman, last summer the INS instituted a designated fingerprinting service to ask local firms to enter into contracts with the INS to help them out in this fingerprinting operation. The Senate bill and the bill before us today does away with outside interests, outside firms, nonprofit organizations from doing the fingerprinting for the Immigration Service. The immigration Service under both products will do this function themselves, and that is fine, and I do not take issue with that because of some of the past problems.

However, the situation that we are looking at today is that the INS is not positive, they are not sure that they are going to refund the fees collected from these organizations who, in good faith, paid the money to do the service for a period of 3 years. I have been contacted in my district by two organizations who sent them their application fee of \$370. Now they are being told by

the Congress, We don't need you any more. Their inquiry is whether or not they are going to get their money back, or a prorated portion of that. I called the INS, and they indicated that they are not sure whether or not they are going to refund the dollars. The amendment's purpose is to mandate that the INS give the money back.

We have just seen hearings in both Houses of Congress this week about a Federal agency which treated our constituents in a shoddy manner, and these tax filers are angry over that. Some time ago we heard about a situation where an elderly individual in error sent a \$50,000 check to the IRS. He subsequently passed away, his heirs found the error, and now they want the money back. The IRS says they are not going to give it back. This is a type of situation that we get ourselves into when the Federal agency does something goofy, similar to what the previous amendment or the speakers on the previous amendment had to relate to us, that now they are charging to talk to them through a 900 number.

Before this thing gets out of hand, know full well, Members, that there are 3,700 organizations who in good faith sent the application through to the INS, sent their \$370. Now we are yanking the task away from them, and I think it is wise that we mandate that the INS give the money back. If we do not need them any more, give the money back.

And let me ask the chairman of the committee to indicate to at least this Member what his knowledge of the situation is and how he could possibly help out in this situation.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLECZKA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman bringing the matter to our attention. Although the gentleman's amendment I think is out of order and he says he is going to withdraw the amendment, nevertheless, in spite of his withdrawing it and in response to his concern, I will be looking into the status of that issue with the INS and the Justice Department to see if there is some way we can resolve the matter, and I appreciate the gentleman's interest.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky very much.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLECZKA. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has raised a real fairness issue here. The INS has gone out, trying to address the tremendous numbers of fingerprints they have to process, and contracted with the private entities to do this, and now the Congress is looking at all that, and I am satisfied with that policy; we are pulling that back in. And it is only

fair, and I appreciate the gentleman bringing that to the committee, and I know that his constituents and all those private sector entities across the country are performing this service and will appreciate his bringing this to our attention too.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, but know full well that I and others in this body who have organizations involved in this will be watching the activity of the INS to make sure that they just give the money back.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF GEORGIA

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. BARR of Georgia:

Page 117, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 617. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to conduct any study of the medicinal use or legalization of marijuana or any other drug or substance in schedule I under part B of the Controlled Substances Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, September 25, 1997, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple, straightforward amendment. It simply reaffirms what I believe to be current policy of this body and current policy of the administration, and that is to not use taxpayer funds for the study of legalization of drugs. And the amendment simply directs that no funds made available under this act for these departments or agencies of the Federal Government shall be used for the study of legalization or medicinal uses of marijuana or any other schedule I controlled substance.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read into the record exactly what a schedule I controlled substance is, and that includes marijuana through its primary ingredient THC. Under title 21, section 812 of the United States Code, a schedule I substance is a, quote, drug or other substance that has a high potential for abuse, close quote. It is further, quote, a drug or other substance that has no currently acceptable and no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States, close quote. Further, quote, there is a lack of accepted safety for use of the drug or other substance under medical supervision, close quote.

That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I think it is entirely appropriate that we make absolutely clear to the American people that our Government is not going to be funding studies that go contrary to well-established existing law based on scientific fact and study over many years.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is entirely consistent with the explicit stated policy of this administration. As evidence of that I quote from a hearing on May 1, 1997, before the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, of which I was present and engaged in questioning with General McCaffrey, head of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and I quote General McCaffrey's response.

It's unequivocally clear in writing, that the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Education and I and others supported, obviously approved by the President, are unalterably opposed to the legalization of drugs for the surreptitious legalization of drugs under the guise of medical uses.

Mr. Chairman, if any department of our Government ought to be using taxpayer funds to study the legalization or so-called medicinal uses of drugs, it ought not to be the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice is tasked under our Constitution and our laws with enforcing our criminal laws, some of which I have just read, the Controlled Substances Act. It would be foolhardy to allow the Department of Justice to talk out of both sides of its mouth, on the one hand enforcing those drug laws which contain as a controlled mind-altering substance marijuana, and yet at the same time talk out of the other side of its mouth in saying, "But we're going to study whether or not it ought to be legalized," which is an implicit message that maybe it ought not to be a controlled substance.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware that the Justice Department is studying the medicinal uses of marijuana. If the gentleman knows about that, I will be very interested to know about it.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment, and in fact support its adoption.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would cite to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky the fact that the administration is proposing to spend \$1 million of taxpayer funds for the so-called medicinal use study of marijuana.

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman would yield, that is not the Justice Department. I am told that is the office of the drug czar in the White House.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. That is correct, that is the ONDCP.

Mr. ROGERS. And, of course, we do not appropriate for the office of the

drug czar in the White House. We appropriate for the Justice Department. Now if the gentleman has information that the Justice Department is studying the legalization or medicinal uses of marijuana, give that to me forthwith.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely correct. At this time we do not. My problem is, and the reason that I think this amendment is necessary, is that even though the director of ONDCP states on record that he is not in favor of studying legalization of drugs, at the same time through his office they are seeking to spend \$1 million. If they can do it in ONDCP, talk out of both sides of their mouth, my fear is other departments, including the Department of Justice, may do the same thing; and I think this is an important guarantee for the people of this country to know that at least these departments, including most importantly the Department of Justice, tasked with enforcing our drug laws, is not and will not be utilizing taxpayer moneys for such foolhardy studies.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Just very briefly, I appreciate the gentleman's affirming that the administration has no intention to undertake such studies or to institute such a policy. To my knowledge, I agree with the gentleman, there is nothing in this bill that relates to the gentleman's amendment, and in that sense the gentleman's amendment really has no effect on our bill. And in that sense it is kind of a progravity amendment and if the gentleman from Kentucky wants to accept it, I certainly do not have opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1200

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have one more colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to enter into a colloquy. I am joined in this colloquy by the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS],

and I do not see him on the floor right now, so, if I may, I will just do my part of this.

I am joining the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] to support continued funding for the Northwest Emergency Assistance Program. The Hire the Fishers Program has been successful in providing jobs for over 300 displaced fisher families in the Pacific Northwest, while working to recover the region's economically vital salmon runs.

The program includes a sea data collection program in order to better manage our salmon fisheries, and a habitat restoration program designed to give fishers an active role in returning the Pacific salmon runs to a harvestable level.

The Hire the Fisher Program, Mr. Chairman, is an excellent model of a Federal-State partnership that works both for the environment and the economy. It is a win-win for the States, the fishers, and the fish. In short, it is a program that continues to deserve our support.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. FURSE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's interest, and also the work of our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], who has been tireless in his pursuit of this issue, as has the gentleman. Both have contacted me about this already, and other programs related to the problems of the Pacific Northwest fisheries. In fact, the bill already provides significant resources to address these problems.

However, the NEAP Program is not a program which has ever been funded out of this bill, and no funds have been requested by the White House in their budget request. However, knowing of the gentleman's interests, that of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and others, I will be happy to look further at the program as we proceed along.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his gracious attention.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HOBSON] having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2267), making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM
HEARINGS NEEDED IN HOUSE NOW

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today, for the first time in this Congress, Democratic determination has produced some results on reducing the influence of special interest campaign money.

A debate is under way at this very moment in this very building on specific bipartisan campaign finance reform, the McCain-Feingold proposal. But it is not enough that reform pass the Senate. In my civics class we learned it has to pass the House of Representatives also. And what is the news on that subject? Today's banner headlines, "GINGRICH Asserts Campaign Bill, Alive in Senate, Is Dead in House."

The American people do not want this proposal stillborn in the House. We are pleased that there is a debate finally after so many Democratic demands underway, but it must occur in both parts of this Capitol Building, not just in one.

As we read on through the story, we learn we have the same problem with the Republican leadership. They say they want more money in campaigns, not less. We need reform now.

NO FEDERAL FUNDING OF STUDIES
OF USE OF MIND-ALTERING
DRUGS

(Mr. BARR of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we just adopted an amendment to the appropriations bill currently before this body that would prohibit, at least for those agencies and departments of this Government covered by that bill, H.R. 2267, that none of them can use any funds so appropriated for the study of legalization or so-called medicinal use of marijuana or other schedule I controlled substances.

Mr. Speaker, I wish it were not necessary to offer such amendments, but it is. The fact of the matter is that even though our Office of National Drug Control Policy asserts under oath and in writing that it is neither the intent nor the purpose of this administration to expend taxpayer moneys for such purposes, such as the medicinal use of marijuana or other drugs or the legalization thereof, they are in fact doing so.

Therefore, these amendments become necessary to stop this administration from talking out of both sides of its mouth on drug policy. This amendment and others I intend to offer on spending bills will send a very clear message to the taxpayers of this country that they are not going to have to continue to fund the study of legalization of mind-altering drugs.

DEBATE NEEDED IN HOUSE ON
CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House. This is where the debate of our constituents is supposed to take place by those who have been elected by them.

But we cannot have a debate, apparently, in the people's House on campaign finance reform, and yet it is campaign contributions and soft money contributions to campaigns that is distorting the decisions that are being made in this House. It is campaign contributions that allow a \$50 billion tax break to be given to the tobacco companies in the middle of the night, with no vote, no discussion, and no debate.

In the other body, in the U.S. Senate, they are starting the debate on campaign finance reform. But here, because of Speaker GINGRICH, Majority Leader ARMEY, we are told we cannot debate that in the people's House.

We need to have that debate. We need to free the people's House from the influence of soft money and special interest contributions that are corrupting the legislative process and are corrupting the democratic process in this country. No longer can we have the decisions being made based upon who gave you a contribution.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 29, 1997

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIMKUS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SHIMKUS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is really now or never. Either this Congress acts now to remedy at least some of the shortcomings of the 1996 campaigns and the way that they are financed, or we can kiss good-bye to any hope of reform in time to affect the 1998 elections.

Many Americans have been concerned about practices and events that occurred in both of the political parties during the 1996 elections. But the time is today to decide, are we going to do anything about it, or just talk about it a little bit more?

Fortunately, the determination of Democrats in the U.S. Senate is leading to action today. As I speak here, in the Senate a specific proposal to change the way campaigns operate is being debated fully, and I am sure it will be discussed over the next several days there. After considerable obstruction by Republicans and the leadership and probably more obstruction to come, there is at least a debate going on there, according to agreed terms.

But here in the House of Representatives, where this proposal must also be approved, we read in this morning's paper, "Gingrich asserts campaign bill, alive in Senate, is dead in house."

Indeed, we find ourselves in a situation where, back in 1995, that same Speaker GINGRICH shook hands with President Clinton and said he wanted to achieve bipartisan campaign finance reform. That is essentially the last we heard of it. The smile had hardly faded before the interest in reforming campaigns, which could have been in place for the 1996 elections, was forgotten. Nothing happened until the eve of the elections, when a contrived proposal was brought here on a very short notice for 1 hour, and even many of our Republican colleagues rejected it, because it was not reform. Rather, it was the kind of proposal that was condemned by every good government group that had worked to reform our campaign and election laws in the past.

I prefer the kind of comprehensive reform that Mr. MCCAIN, a Republican, and Mr. FEINGOLD, a Democrat, are urging over in the Senate. But whatever the approach that we might take

to reform this system, and there may be many good ideas, there have been many proposals advanced, the question is, Will we have a firm day now in terms of debate that provide for full and fair discussion of the proposals?

I must say that this same story from this morning's paper is not very encouraging in that regard. It does point out, as for the House, Republican leaders have been publicly silent, until this week, on the idea of bringing up the campaign finance bill, even as Democrats agitated daily for a vote on this issue.

We have had to file motions to adjourn, to approve the Journal, to count the votes, to do these various things, because under our rules, we have no other mechanism to adjourn the special interests that want to dominate this House and that have influenced legislation with the \$50 billion tax break for tobacco companies and so many other ways this year.

You give the most soft money in the first 6 months, and in the seventh month you get a \$50 billion tax break that all the rest of us have to pay for. That is wrong. But it is not just a matter of talking about it up here and talking about it in the Senate. We have got to do something about it. And the "something" is comprehensive reform that is scheduled now.

But if we read on in this morning's paper, what we learn is that the kind of reform that the Speaker says might come up sometime this fall, and fall has already begun, is not reform, but it would allow unlimited personal contributions.

□ 1215

He wants to solve the problem of big money influence on this body that is crippling the operation of our Congress; he wants to solve the big money problem by making it bigger. Let the big boys give what they are giving now, and let them give any amount they want to do to influence the priorities of this Congress. That is not reform, it is repealing the only reforms that we have been able to get on the books thus far.

We need a real reform, not a repeal of the existing law, little as it is, to try to control the way the system has operated, and that real reform could come as early as next week.

I am pleased that this same story reports that our leader, the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. GEPHARDT], has written to Speaker GINGRICH and he has said, "Until we receive your commitment to follow through on rhetorical offerings," and that is all we have had, "we shall not treat these overtures as serious," and certainly they should not be, "and we will continue our efforts to force action to daily floor proceedings."

That is precisely what will occur on this floor on next Monday, and it is precisely what will occur in the future. Until we get fair play in this House, until the American people have a

chance to see specific proposals out here, we will have other procedural votes to get the American people the reform that they deserve.

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, just a short while ago we had a vote to cut \$54 million out of the U.N. appropriation. The vote tally was 242 to 165, 165 in favor of cutting this \$54 million of so-called past dues.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] for bringing to this our attention, because I think it is a very important point, because we are never reimbursed for all of the peacekeeping missions throughout the world. Therefore, they actually owe us, we do not owe them. So it is rather sad to see that we, as a Congress, cannot rectify this; instead, we vote more funds for the United Nations.

Of course, I do not hide the fact that I do not think a lot about the United Nations. I think ultimately it is very detrimental to America's policy and very detrimental to our sovereignty, so I have a specific agenda in that regard.

Actually, the problems we face with the United Nations can be solved, because there has been a compromise offered. Instead of abolishing the United Nations like I would like to do, I think Ted Turner has offered us a real solution. Ted Turner is a very wealthy man, has made a lot of money in the capital system, and he is voluntarily willing to submit \$1 billion to continue with the United Nations, and I think that is fine. I think the United Nations ought to be funded by donations such as from Ted Turner. An additional advantage of having Ted Turner send his money to the United Nations, we can be assured that with the next war started by the United Nations, we can send Jane Fonda to do the fighting for us.

On another subject, I want to just mention something about the recent discussions we have had here on the floor here in the last week on the pay raise. I am not in favor of the pay raise. I voted against the pay raise. As a matter of fact, I think our pension fund is outrageously obscene, and I do not participate in it. But in comparison to some other matters, I think the amount of attention that we gave to the pay raise is probably a little bit more than needed to be done.

For instance, the pay raise, after taxes, would come to \$40 a week, but nevertheless, I think the point was well taken that we should not be taking a pay raise when so many people in this country are actually suffering the consequence of a decreasing standard of living. Until we solve that, I do not be-

lieve we should be taking a pay raise. That so-called pay raise would have been a 2.3-percent COLA increase.

But in comparison to what we were doing in the particular bill that that was attached to, the Treasury-Postal Service appropriation, informed many Members of the Congress that were not aware of it, but in this bill, we actually increase the budget for the IRS by more than a half a billion dollars. At the same time we hold these grand hearings, make grand speeches against the IRS, and at the very same time we are expanding the role and the power and the authority of the IRS by expanding their budget by more than a half a billion dollars.

Then there is another agency of government that is probably the second least favorite of mine to the IRS, and that is the BATF. The BATF budget was increased 14 percent. It went up \$66 million. So at the time we were talking about a small cost-of-living increase for Congress, which again I oppose, we at the same time were pretending that we were fighting this IRS and the abuse of the IRS, but expanding the role of the IRS.

I think what we need to do is get things in perspective. I think that first off, we should exist here for the liberty, protection of liberties of American citizens; we should be protecting the sovereignty of the United States; we should not be paying the dues out of proportion to what everybody else pays throughout the world at the same time we sacrifice much of our liberties and we live in a nation today where our troops are actually serving under the commanders of foreign generals. Everybody I talk to, everybody in my district I talk to, they do not like this. They would like to see this change.

So once again, I would like to express the sadness about the recent vote that we could not even cut the \$54 million away from what is called overdue back dues for the United Nations. I think it is so important that we put all of this in perspective. Yes, we do not need pay raises, but we certainly do not need to raise the amount of money we give the IRS and the BATF.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the pictures that have been painted in the hearings in the Senate and in the disclosures by national news media about what took place in the last campaign is not a pretty picture for the American people.

In fact, I am sure it is quite painful when they see that the last campaign of what we call soft money, that is money that essentially is not regulated by Federal campaign laws, was made in contributions to both parties, both major parties in this country, in huge

amounts by individuals, and the story that unfolds is that that soft money was all about access. It was all about access to the White House; it was all about access to the Republican committee chairmen in the House, and the Republican committee chairmen in the Senate, and the leadership in the House and in the Senate. Letters went out and told people, if they gave \$10,000, they could have lunch with chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, or the Committee on Labor, or the Committee on Ways and Means, or in the Senate one could have lunch or dinner or a private meeting, and for \$25,000 one could be in on strategy sessions.

The average American could not even dream of being in on one of those sessions. But that soft money then started to dictate, as we saw in the previous session, even before this election, lobbyists and powerful people sitting in the offices of the Republican leadership drafting legislation to weaken the Clean Air Act, to weaken the Clean Water Act, to weaken the health safety acts that protect our families and children against unhealthy food, to weaken the meat inspection act after people have died because of bad meat in the marketplace. But the lobbyists, they had access, because they gave \$10,000, they gave \$100,000. And the crescendo really came in campaign finance reform, or really about bad campaign practices, the crescendo came just about 1 month ago or 2 months ago when we did the Balanced Budget Tax Relief Act.

Members in this House voted on an act believing they were balancing the budget and providing tax relief. However, later we found out that the interests, the tobacco interests that gave the most money to the Republican Party, to the leadership, the individual Members of the Republican leadership, they were able to get a meeting that no other American could get. They were able to get a meeting where in the middle of the night, with no vote, no hearing, no discussion, and apparently, if we listen to the people, no authors, but an amendment got into that bill that provided \$50-, 5-0, \$50 billion in tax breaks for the tobacco companies that have been killing our citizens and lying about it for 50 years.

How did they do it? They did it because they gave hundreds of thousands of dollars to members of the leadership, to the Republican Party, to the Republican conventions, and the payoff day was the day that bill was passed.

Now, fortunately, because of Senator DURBIN over on the other side and Senator COLLINS and the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. LOWEY, here, when they made us vote in the light of the day, it went away, because we shined democracy, we shined light, we shined the public perception. The press could see what was going on, and nobody would claim that amendment. But a few hundred thousand dollars got the amendment into the bill.

That is why we have been having procedural votes in this House, because we have to end this system that allows the people to sit in the galleries, but the special interests to sit in the office of the Speaker and the majority whip and design legislation; that allows the people to stand outside and petition us on the steps, but allows the special interests to sit down and have dinner and talk about how they can redesign the communications business and who gets access to this billion-dollar giveaway and that billion-dollar giveaway, and the networks will not be charged for using the public airways. That is what has to stop. That is what this week was about.

Finally, finally, after this week, we get some utterances from the other side that maybe they will allow a debate on campaign finance reform. They will not tell us when, they will not tell us how, and they are not even sure they will do it.

We deserve better, and the American people deserve better. The U.S. Senate today has started debate on campaign finance reform, and yet in the House we cannot even discuss it. We cannot even discuss it because of huge contributions to the Republican leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members not to refer to individual Senators or to characterize Senate action or inaction.

ENERGY POLICY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIMKUS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, in 1992, Congress passed the Energy Policy Act which set Federal requirements on the use of alternative fuel vehicles such as ethanol-powered cars. This legislation required Federal, State, and city fleets to use vehicles that are cleaner and better for our environment. This act listed fuels and vehicle types that can be used by fleet managers to comply with this act.

Unfortunately, biodiesel was not one of the listed alternative fuels at the time because the industry was new, untested, unproven. However, today, that is not the case. As a result, I am introducing a bill, along with the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY], to classify biodiesel as an alternative fuel under the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Biodiesel is a renewable alternative fuel for diesel engines derived from soybeans. Once biodiesel is classified as an alternative fuel under this bill, it will be used immediately in conventional diesel engines with no engine modifications needed. A few examples of the type of vehicles using this B-20 mix are heavy-duty fleet vehicles such as city buses, boats, and trucks.

The diesel engines will use biodiesel in blends of 20 percent biodiesel and 80 percent petroleum diesel, which is the

most efficient, energy-efficient, and environmentally beneficial mix.

□ 1230

The use of biodiesel will help to save on capital expenditures as fleets will be able to modify and improve their existing vehicles, as opposed to purchasing completely new fleets.

The production, sale, and use of biodiesel will create a new market for our farmers, and, in turn, boost our economy. Because it runs cleaner than regular diesel fuel, the use of biodiesel also means that fewer emissions, as an example, particulate matter, hydrocarbons, and carbon monoxide, are released to our environment.

By granting alternative fuel status to biodiesel this bill will promote economic development and energy security. Biodiesel means jobs and tax revenues for processing a greater portion of our domestic soybean oil in the United States.

The emerging biodiesel market offers a stable, long-term market for efficiently produced domestic soybeans that will directly benefit American farmers. The use of domestic biodiesel also improves national energy security by displacing imported energy, such as foreign oil.

It is important to note that this legislation does not create a tax break or a new Federal mandate. This bill will simply allow the biodiesel industry to compete in the alternative fuel market, giving fleet vehicle managers more flexibility in complying with the mandates required at the Federal level.

The production, sale, and use of biodiesel is good for the environment, good for family farmers, good for the economy, and good for our energy security. As a Congressman from one of the largest agricultural producer States in the United States, creating new markets for our family farmers, helping the economy, and keeping our air clean is very important to me.

In a time that we are looking for answers to environmental concerns, new markets for family farmers and a boost for the economy and energy security, biodiesel makes sense for everyone.

THE HOUSE LEADERSHIP SHOULD SCHEDULE DEBATE AND A VOTE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to echo the comments of my colleagues and urge that this body bring up campaign finance reform and pass meaningful campaign finance reform in this session.

I think the biggest reason I want to see this happen is because of the lack of confidence that the public has in this body. There is a crisis in our democracy that I think too few people have noticed; that is, the majority of

the citizens of this democracy do not have trust and confidence in their government. That is essential in a democracy. The people are the government. If they do not trust us, we have a crisis that blocks our ability to stand up to almost any meaningful issue.

I have said before that it is impossible to lead if no one is willing to follow. We cannot step up to problems like health care, Social Security and Medicare reform, balancing the budget, or education. A lot of meaningful issues have taken longer and longer to deal with because the public does not trust its leaders.

There are a lot of reasons for that. Some of them are justified and some of them are not, admittedly. One reason for the distrust is the system by which we elect our Representatives, the system by which we finance campaigns. There is a perception and a reality out there that the campaigns are funded almost exclusively by people with a lot of money. If you do not have a lot of money to bring to the process, you have no access to the process, and that has turned people off. We are seeing lower and lower numbers of people participating in the system. We need to show them that we can change this system in order to get their confidence back, so we can govern again.

Ironically, I have heard a lot of my colleagues tell me that, gosh, when we go home for town meetings, when we talk to people, no one is talking about campaign finance reform. It is not really an issue they care about. It is not a so-called pocketbook issue. It does not directly affect their ability to get a job or feed their family or educate their children, so therefore, they really do not care about it.

But what I have heard when I go home on the weekend, and go out and talk to the people in my district, is the reason they do not care about it is because they do not think we are going to do anything about it.

We sort of have a self-fulfilling prophecy with Members of Congress saying, gosh, the public does not care, and not doing anything about it, so yes, the public does not care because they do not think anything is going to happen. They do not believe this body is ever going to step up to the plate and change it, because they think we are comfortable in the current system.

If we want them to care about it, we have to show them we are serious about it. That is the first point. The second point is, they do care about it on a deeper level. They care about it in the sense that they do not trust the system of government. We do not want a democracy where the people do not care about their system of government.

We cannot say we do not need to step up to an issue because apathy has overtaken it. We need an active and involved electorate in a democracy, if we are truly going to be able to represent the people. That means we need to pass campaign finance reform.

I rise specifically in support of House bill 1776, which is the updated version

of the Shays-Meehan bill. I do that because there are two very important aspects to that bill. First of all, it bans soft money. I do not believe that there is anything wrong with people participating in our election system. I, for one, do not believe that we should go to an exclusively publicly financed system. I think it is very important that the members of a community are personally involved in campaigns, that they support the candidates that they like and get involved in the process so they are more involved in it down the road. It is important that people contribute.

The only time we have a problem is when those contributions are so large from certain people as to drown out the rest. When someone has the ability to give \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000 to a system, I can readily understand how one of my constituents says, gosh, all I can do is afford to give \$50, and what difference does it make, if the politicians are going to get \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000 from somebody else?

Back in the 1970's we came up with a reform proposal to deal with this. We placed limits on the amount people could contribute: \$1,000 for an individual, \$5,000 for a group of individuals, what is known as a PAC. I think that is perfectly appropriate. Those are real limits that allow everybody to participate up to a certain point.

The problem is, with soft money those limits are meaningless. We see fundraisers every day around here for \$5,000, \$10,000, as much as \$25,000 or \$50,000 a person. I remember hearing a story from somebody about how many \$100,000 contributors Michael Dukakis had back in 1988, and I was stunned by this notion. I said, but there are limits, \$1,000 per person. How could any Presidential candidates have a \$100,000 contributor? The answer of course was it was soft money.

It was interesting to me. The person who was telling this made no distinction whatsoever between the soft money contribution and the individual contribution. There is a very good reason for that. Around the halls of Washington, DC, there is no distinction. Soft money has rendered limits meaningless. We need to ban soft money in order to make those 1970 reforms have some meaning.

I can understand the cynicism of the public in dealing with that issue. I urge that we support campaign finance reform. The other aspect of the bill that I like is putting some teeth in the Federal Elections Commission and actually enforcing the laws.

INCLUDE THE BECK DECISION IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM AND REPUBLICANS WILL SUPPORT IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about campaign finance reform. There are a lot of us that would like to do it and have it brought before the floor. But do we think the Democrats would include the Beck decision, where the union bosses cooperatively hold hostage their workers to contribute to their campaigns and their finances?

The gentleman from Nevada, Mr. JOHN ENSIGN, in Las Vegas, NV, had \$1 million put against him just by the unions, coordinated by the DNC. The gentlewoman from Idaho, Mrs. HELEN CHENOWETH had \$1 million by the unions, coordinated by the DNC against one candidate. What about the gentlewoman from Idaho, Mrs. CHENOWETH, what about the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. J.D. HAYWORTH, \$1 million by the DNC?

Thirty percent of the workers in the unions are Republican. About another 10 percent are independent. So that is 40 percent of the population that is being forced with union wages to contribute, and then that money is being used against Republicans, against their will. But do the Democrats want the Beck decision in any campaign finance reform? Absolutely not, because it takes the power of the union bosses away.

Unions only represent about 6 percent of the work force in this entire Nation, 6 percent. Yet, they say they stand for the working person. Small business and business makes up about 94 percent of all the jobs in this country. They say they are for the working person, but union legislation, from strikebreaker on down, is there to combat and fight against and destroy small business.

My colleague, the gentleman from California, talks about campaign finance reform and its influence. Let me read this:

The proletariat will use all political supremacy wrested by the position of the ruling class to establish democracy.

Have we heard anything about class warfare on this floor by the gentleman from California? The proletariat will use political supremacy to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state. One, abolish all private property. Over 50 percent of California is owned by the government. Yet, the gentleman from California in the California Desert plan would have more and more and more lands put in there.

Heavy progressive income taxes. The unions supported the Democrats because they want big government. They want the power centralized in Washington. They use big government, which causes higher taxes, which causes people and small business to die every single day, and jobs. And the union bosses force this, but yet it is supported by the gentleman from California.

Second, abolishing the right of inheritance: the death tax. Where do these three things come from? Where does

property, private property abolition, heavy progressive taxes, inheritance tax, come from? It comes from the Communist Manifesto, written by Carl Marx and Engels.

What else do they have in this, in their plan? Centralization of credit in the hands of the state. No. 8: equal obligation of all do work, but control by unions, organized unions, right here in the Communist Manifesto.

Free education for all. That is not bad, but it is controlled in the hands of the state.

Let me read here. The gentleman from California, union, \$2,000. The gentleman from California, union, \$5,000. The gentleman from California, union, \$1,200. The gentleman from California, union; American, Federal, State and County, union, \$4,500; American Maritime, union, \$1,000; union, \$1,000; union, \$500; union, \$1,000; union, \$1,000; union, \$500; union, for the gentleman from California, \$5,000; union, \$2,000; union \$500; union, \$1,500; on and on and on, and pages from unions. Yet, do they want the union and the Beck decision put into campaign finance reform? Absolutely not. They want to do away with a normal progression.

What is a PAC, Mr. Speaker? A PAC is a group of businesses or organizations for a single purpose. They band together to fight against the power of the unions to direct money against them.

Yes, we want campaign finance reform, but we want fair reform. Include the Beck decision in campaign finance reform and we will support it.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PREVENTS DEBATE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the staff being around here on a Friday afternoon as we discuss these issues.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker talked about how he would like to know where we Democrats stand on some of these issues on campaign finance reform. We Democrats would like to know how everyone in this House stands on campaign finance reform, but until a bill is allowed to come to the House, we are not going to do anything.

The Democrats do not control the House right now, the Republican leadership controls that House. If they want to know how we stand on campaign finance reform, then let these issues come to the floor of the House. It is not our fault that there have not been votes on campaign finance reform, it is the fault of the Republican leadership that is now in control of this House.

That is why, for this past week or so, we have seen a series of motions to adjourn and motions to rise, these kinds

of procedural votes, trying to send a message to the Republican leadership: we have important work to do on campaign finance reform, and we have got to do a better job of bringing that issue to the floor of the House before we can move ahead on other matters.

Why do we care about campaign finance reform? What do we see as the problem under the current law? I brought a sample check here. Members are obviously going to be able to tell it is not a real check because it is signed by my friend, Ima Big Donor.

Ms. Big Donor decided she wanted to make a contribution to the political party of her choice, any old political party. She decided, like Mr. Ted Turner, that she had done well in the market in the last year, and she was going to donate extra money that she had to her political party. So she made out the check for \$1 billion, \$1 billion, enough to fund a thousand political House campaigns.

We might think, well, surely under current law the \$1 billion check would be illegal, since I as an individual can only give \$1,000 to a candidate. But no, under our current system of law, there is unlimited ability to donate money to the political parties, whether you are an individual, whether you are a union, or whether you are a corporation.

Why would someone like Mrs. Big Donor want to donate \$1 billion? Just check her check: for access, for access. Is that not what Mr. Tamraz testified to last week before the Senate committee?

□ 1245

Why would he give \$300,000? Why would he give \$600,000? For access. He is not a fool. It got him in the doors he wanted to get in. This is legal under our current system and it needs to be reformed.

I am one of those candidates that does not like to raise money. I do not think many candidates like to raise money. I think raising money makes us weird. Raising this kind of big money makes our democracy weird, and the American people want to change that system.

Until the Republican leadership lets campaign finance reform bills come to the House for discussion, we are not only not going to know how everyone wants to vote on these things, but the American people are not going to see the kind of changes and reform that they want.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would just say that he is absolutely right, because the fact of the matter is, and what Democrats have been calling for for the last several weeks by asking for procedural votes, motions to adjourn, et cetera, was an effort to bring to the floor, because the Republican majority in this House, the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, will not allow us to bring up the issue of campaign fi-

nance reform. The only tools that are available to the minority party are procedural votes. So the public understands what is going on here.

The fact of the matter is, on both sides of the aisle we need to have a thorough and a complete conversation and debate about campaign finance reform. They do not want to let us. And I will tell my colleagues why they do not want to let us. If we read Mr. GINGRICH in the paper today, the Speaker will support a bill that let the good times roll; open up the floodgates; allow all kinds of money to come into the system.

My colleagues, it is not the kind of reform the American people are looking for. What he says is that there is not enough money in politics; we need more money in politics. The Washington Post has said 8 in 10 Americans believe money has too much influence on who wins elections, but the Speaker says we need more money.

Our colleague on the other side of the aisle just a minute ago was talking about influence in the process. If we want to talk about influence, which the American public gets in a second, \$50 billion in a tax break to the tobacco industry, not just a few weeks ago, and guess who was the single biggest contributor to the Republican campaign in the last election? It does not take a rocket scientist to figure it out. The tobacco industry.

And, fortunately, in the Senate and in this body, we said no to that kind of a payoff. That is what we have to stop here, is to make sure that we have the opportunity to get the people in the process and get the specialists out of it.

Let me just say what even his colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, has said about the Doolittle bill that the Speaker would support, would bring us back to the dark ages. Let us get out of the dark ages. Let us bring campaign finance reform into the light.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to address the same issue many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have addressed to date, and that is simply campaign finance reform, and once again reiterate that all of the procedural steps that have been seen over the past several weeks are, in fact, the only way that the minority can try to shed some light and focus the attention on this particular issue.

It has been made clear to us and to the American people that there is no current intention of the leadership on the majority side of this House to bring that issue forward for deliberation, for debate and for a vote. And while we are talking about this issue, I want to broaden the discussion a little bit, because once again I feel that the House

of Representatives is going to be behind the States in taking action and way behind the American people as individuals.

When people talk about reforming the current system, they talk about something bold, they talk about actual reform. I do not believe there is a great deal of interest of people looking at incremental changes or marginal changes around the edges of what we have, rather we are talking about doing something fundamental because we need to have the confidence back in our system.

We need, in fact, to know that every piece of legislation we put out of this body has credibility so that the American people understand that it is their business being done and not the business of a special few who can give not just hundreds of thousands of dollars but the \$1,000, the \$2,000. The small percentage of people in this country that actually contribute to campaigns should be no less certain that the \$1,000 and \$2,000 contributions of individuals get some sort of access than they are about the hundreds of thousands or \$200,000 contributions that are made in so-called soft money, which a friend of mine likens to money put into a blender. It is run through the blender so when it comes out nobody is sure where it came from. We have a right to know where the money comes from. We have a right to have control over our system.

Sometime ago, months ago, I put on the floor of this House a bill, H.R. 2199, entitled "Clean Money, Clean Election Campaign Finance Reform." It is modeled after what happened in Maine when the people in Maine took a referendum and decided they wanted to own their system; they wanted to have control over their electoral process and they would publicly fund the campaigns in that State.

They understood that if they were going to have people come down and do their business, they wanted to make sure that they knew who they were and that they had decided, just like big corporations invest in the selection of people that run their corporations, as voters they had to invest in knowing who was coming here. We have to make sure it is not the people that are funded by tobacco companies or other huge corporations, or individuals that are so well off or so vested in the process that they are putting forth the money in thousand dollar increments.

The States know it. The State of Maine went out in a referendum and put in a system. The legislature in Vermont went out and put in place a similar system. In a dozen polls across this country, in States that are considered to be liberal or progressive, in States considered conservative, the people have spoken out that they think public financing of campaigns is the way to proceed.

USA Today acclaims the States are leading the way in cleaning up campaigns. They talk about the fact that

in Maine they have an even better idea than just putting limits in there, they are going to fund the campaigns so that they know that they own their own process.

The Boston Globe several weeks ago supported the concept. In Wisconsin, the Daily Tribune Wisconsin Rapids says public financing will give true reform. In St. Louis, the St. Louis Post Dispatch, in its editorial, says public financing is the answer.

The American people want their system back. This House fails to take a bold step on either side of the aisle. I think we have to understand that if the people are going to have confidence in this body they have to have confidence that we will do something, not just work around the margins and not proceed forward.

People want limited campaign seasons, not endless campaigns. They want to know their elected officials do not spend their life at fundraisers and on the phone asking for money. They want to know that the free air time is available to candidates because the spectrum that broadcasters get for free belongs to the American people. They want to make sure that there is an even and level playing field so that candidates, no matter what their personal wealth or no matter what their ability to get the attraction of large corporations or other big investors involved in their campaign, will have the ability, through good organization, through leadership abilities to go out and address the people and get elected.

A fair campaign that would attract candidates, that would get people involved in a process that we would know we as voters control is where this thing should be moving. The American people are there, certainly it is now finally being reflected in editorials, the AFL-CIO is willing to give the Beck decision or whatever else they want if we go to that system, and in fact the large donors and huge corporations the other day agreed and said they too are tired of giving money and they would go to that system.

Simply speaking, what we need to do is have a system like that that does not unilaterally disarm any party. That is what we need, is something everybody can coalesce behind.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to yield to my colleague from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my friend for yielding to me.

As the gentleman knows, the days and years roll by and more money continues to flow into Washington, hundreds, thousands, millions of dollars into campaigns, into political parties, and the Speaker of the House, the Speaker of the House, of the people's House, continues to say that it is not

that it is too much money, it is not enough. He wants more money, unlimited amounts, to come into the House, into campaigns and to political parties.

Our present system is polluting the political process. It stinks. This is not the way to conduct the people's business, with hundreds, thousands and millions of dollars coming in. And the Speaker refuses to do anything; refuses to allow us to have a vote, a debate on campaign finance reform.

It is time, I think, my colleagues, that we say to the Speaker, "How long will you wait?" This is not in keeping with the democratic process. Let us have a vote. Let us have a clean debate on campaign finance reform. That must take place if we are going to restore a sense of faith and trust and confidence in the democratic process in America.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank my colleague from Georgia, and let me just say that I woke up this morning and reads the headlines of the newspapers, and I think everyone in America has looked and seen that the Democrats have been trying to delay and procrastinate in the procedures and shut this place down, if need be, in order to get a vote on campaign finance reform.

Now, all of us have looked at the newspapers and on television over the last months and there has been a lot of attention on the problems with our campaign finance system; the fact that there is too much money involved in American politics; the fact that here we are at a critical time and trying to protect America's children from tobacco, and we find the tobacco companies gave millions of dollars in the last election cycle; and the only way we will do anything about this is by forcing a debate on campaign finance reform.

Now, it is interesting that at the same time the other body is taking up campaign finance reform and taking up a bill that is sponsored by Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD, that has the support of nearly every newspaper in America, nearly every public interest group that has been working on campaign finance reform in America, that we find that the Speaker of the House, at the same time this bill is being debated, has a headline in the New York Times which reads "Gingrich Asserts Campaign Bill Is Dead in the House."

Well, I am joining with a Republican Member, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CHRIS SHAYS], and a number of Members of the House, at one o'clock, and we are going to have a press conference to announce that campaign finance reform is not dead in the House. As a matter of fact, we are going to introduce early next week a revised reform bill based on a scaled-back McCain-Feingold, Shays-Meehan bill.

Now, what does it do? No. 1, it bans soft money. The fund-raising controversies that we have heard about by and large have been soft money, the ability of someone to go into the Speaker's office or go into the White

House or anyplace else with a check for \$50,000 or \$100,000. That should be illegal.

We ought to have a vote on the floor of the House and let Members vote whether they think it should be illegal or not. Certainly 80 to 90 percent of the American public think it should be illegal. The Speaker thinks it ought to be legal. He thinks there is not enough money being spent on campaigns in America, and that is the opposite of the truth.

The evidence is overwhelming that the time has come for campaign finance reform. The Speaker says that we need more money involved in this process. The truth is money is corrupting American politics and everyone knows it. We are going to file a bill that will ban soft money, that will give better disclosure requirements, greater disclosure and better enforcement from the Federal Election Commission.

All of us here today believe that the Speaker's desire to vastly increase the amount of money in the current system would be a disaster for democracy. I am confident that the Members of this House are going to stand up to the Speaker and, if we need to do it, we will file a discharge petition and require that there be a vote on the floor of this House to ban soft money.

One person cannot stand in the way of campaign finance reform, and I believe that the membership of this House is ready to take on Speaker GINGRICH and require that there be a vote on campaign finance reform and a vote to abolish soft money.

FAST-TRACK TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks about trade, let me associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who have spoken this afternoon on the issue of campaign reform.

The system in the country is broken. If we ever needed any more evidence of its dilapidated state, all we have to do is pick the morning papers up, listen to the morning radio, watch the evening news. It is zapping the energy, the integrity, the heart of the Democratic system in our country today.

□ 1300

The present system is a disaster. It needs to be scrapped. People spend too much time raising money, going after money, and not enough time focusing on the problems that face this country. I believe we are in a process of watching it die. And it will die, and it will come down.

As my friends and colleagues have said in these last 30 or 40 minutes, they on this side of the aisle, for the most

part, do not get it. The Speaker wants to spend more money. He wants to provide more access to the big boys and take away our ability to have a say in what happens in this very building.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add those notes before I talk about fast track.

Fast track is probably, I could make a transition here, but I will not at this point. I will save that for another day because there is a transition to be made with respect to our trade policies and how this institution operates and how this city operates.

As the vote over NAFTA expansion gets closer, there are a lot of people who are calling for attention. Some are politicians. Some are CEO's. Some speak for farmers. Other stand for labor. Some hire consultants. Some go on TV. Even cartoon characters like Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse have lobbyists in this building and downtown looking after them.

All of these interests have a voice, and they are shouting to be heard. But some of the people with the most at stake in this debate have been silent, or are silent. They do not have a choice. They do not have a choice voice. I am talking about children. I want to talk a little about children before I get into the heart of the trade issue because I believe this gets to the heart of the trade issue.

As many as 11 million children today toil day after day in the fields and in the factories of Mexico. They pick tomatoes. They pick onions. They pick strawberries. They glue soles on shoes. They unload and load crates of produce that weigh more than they do.

Starting at 7 years of age, millions of Mexican children are kept out of school and are forced to work, often exposing them to the most dangerous pesticides and toxins. And we say, "well, is not child labor prohibited under NAFTA?" Sure it is. But the Mexican Government just looks the other way. And what is even worse, multinational corporations in this country, employers who go over and establish businesses in Mexico, and this Government of ours looks the other way as well.

According to the U.S. News and World Report, the three NAFTA governments have not filed a single complaint in Mexican child labor even though it is commonplace, not a single complaint. I am willing to bet that of all the experts touting NAFTA, of all the armchair economists, of all of those pushing fast track expansion today, none of them would want their kids, children, quitting elementary school to pick tomatoes laced with pesticides.

Are they really willing to sacrifice their education, the health and the future of poor Mexican children, at the altar of free trade? Child labor does not just affect lives in Mexico. It is putting downward pressure on the standards in the United States.

How does this work? We say to ourselves, "What has this got to do with

America? What has this got to do with our workers? What has this got to do with our industries?" Well, how can a tomato farmer in Florida who adheres to our labor and environmental standards compete with someone who pays children pennies an hour and who pollutes with impunity?

That is what our workers are up against, our business people are up against, companies that pollute with impunity with these toxins and pesticides, pesticides, by the way, that got into the strawberries, came into this country. One hundred seventy-nine children in Michigan were poisoned with strawberries that were contaminated, some very seriously, life-or-death situations, because those vegetables and those fruits are not checked.

We say, "Well, do they not inspect them when they come into the border?" 3.3 million trucks go across that border every year, 10,000 trucks a day. Do my colleagues know how many of them get inspected? One percent. They call it a wave line. The inspector stands there and waves them on through. The line stretches for miles, truckers honking their horns, and they just wave them on through.

It is not contaminated fruits and vegetables that get through into our market now. It is also what else is in the compartment of those trucks; like 70 percent of all the cocaine that comes into the United States comes from Mexico today. That is another story.

Let me get back to that tomato farmer. He or she cannot compete with what is coming in from Mexico today because in Mexico we have got kids that are 7, 8, 9 picking it for pennies, and we have got pesticides and toxins that are prohibited here being used.

That is why America's trade agreements must include strong, enforceable protection for workers and the environment. That is why we have been coming to the floor day after day, week after week, month after month, saying, Mr. President, colleagues on this side of the aisle, some of my own colleagues, these are the standards that we need to have as we move into this new century of ours. We will be setting the pattern in this fast track on what will be negotiated in trade for the next century.

We cannot stay with the policies that take us back to the conditions of the 19th century, and that is what the administration's policy basically does. It will move us down on wages, on working conditions, on health conditions to a 19th century standard. It will take us back in the past. We need to move people forward. We need to have Mexican workers and Chilean workers and their environments meet the standards that we have established here in the United States rather than our workers coming down to their standards.

Our trade agreement should harness the power of markets to lift standards abroad, not lower ours. And if we sacrifice our standards, we sacrifice not

only standards, but the values, the values that literally hundreds of thousands of workers over the last 100 years in this country sacrificed for. And when I say "sacrificed," we have to kind of flashback in our memories to what our grandparents and our parents did to make sure we got an 8-hour day, a 40-hour workweek, to make sure they got proper medical care, they got health insurance, they got pensions, they got decent wages, they got the right to collective bargaining, they got the right to strike. They got all these rights so they could harness their energies and create the most viable and vibrant middle class in the history of the world.

And now all these things are being eroded because these benefits that were gotten oftentimes by people who marched, who went to jail, who were beaten, some even died in order for these rights in this country, they are being eroded by the fact that companies are moving over to Mexico and other places that do not enforce these rights; and then these companies in this country say, well, we will move our facilities down to Mexico if you do not agree to a wage freeze, if you do not agree to a benefit freeze, if you do not agree to these environmental concerns that we have.

And do not take my word for it. There was a study done by a woman by the name of Kate Brothenbrenner from Cornell University. She found that 62 percent of corporations in America today, 62 percent, have used the NAFTA agreement and similar agreements to bring down or to pressure employees to keep wages and benefits at the same or a lower level. Now that is an incredible downward pressure on benefits and wages that people have fought for for the last 100 years.

Profiting from child labor runs contrary to everything America stands for. Remember the soccer ball situation we had in this country? American kids became aware that they were out there on Saturday and Sunday kicking that soccer ball after school, and someone told them that the people that were stitching those soccer balls together were 6-, 7- and 8-year-olds in Pakistan, who were working 10 hours a day, not going to school, not getting any of the things that they were having, in order for American children to play soccer. So a campaign erupted in this country in which children all over the country and teachers and coaches made an effort to change that. And we changed it. We put pressure, and we changed it.

We need to do the same thing with respect to child labor in Mexico and other parts of this planet that exploit children. If we continue to look the other way instead of addressing it effectively and forcefully in our trade agreements, we betray our values, and we betray our children.

Now let me talk about something else. The administration would like to have fast track in time for the Presi-

dent's trip to South America next month. Beginning on November 12, the President is scheduled to make visits to Venezuela, Brazil, and Argentina in order to develop support for creating a free-trade area for the Americas.

For months now the administration has been saying that it is crucial for fast track to be passed by the House before this trip, that it will demonstrate American leadership. Of course, the administration only sent up fast track proposal to Congress last week, and already we know that the fast track that they are asking us to pass is actually a step backward from the Reagan-Bush administration fast track that they used, by the way, to pass NAFTA 4 years ago.

Many of us have said that a new trade negotiating authority must look forward and address issues that have been neglected so far in our trade agreements, because the reality of this phenomenon we call globalization is that workers, our environment, and our food is as affected by these changes as intellectual property, as telecommunications, as automobile production. And those things are protected, the latter thing that I mentioned. Intellectual property, Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck, and Bill Gates, they are protected. Their property is protected. Automobile production, protected. But when it comes to workers' standards, no, no. The difference is that intellectual property and all these things that I talked about and content laws do get addressed, but safe and fair working conditions, environmental standards and ensuring that imported food is safe do not get addressed.

Instead of incorporating these issues into trade negotiations more fully and completely, this fast track proposal actually restricts our ability to include legitimate issues in trade agreements that directly impact consumers and workers. It is clearly, clearly a step backward.

We propose that American leadership be used to develop a trade agreement with Latin America that will lift workers up, not tie them down. We cannot let this fast track be used simply to expand NAFTA, because we know it will not work.

Look at the last 4 years and the impact NAFTA has had on wages and the environment and on food and even on drugs. It is a horrible record. But we are being asked to endorse this record. We are being asked to sanction it, to put our stamp of approval on it, to give it our blessing, to ignore the flaws as they expand NAFTA to other countries in this hemisphere.

The same old argument is being trotted out again as to why we must pass fast track quickly and expand NAFTA. The administration says it is essential that they have this, otherwise they will be left behind in South America; we will lose out to Europe. But that argument does not stand up to the test. They used it 4 years ago to sell us NAFTA.

The NAFTA proponents were saying back then, "If we do not pass NAFTA, Europe and Japan will get into Mexico, and they will lock us out. We will lose out." And the Japanese laughed at that statement, by the way. And the record of NAFTA shows a much different story.

Before NAFTA, the United States had a trade surplus of nearly \$2 billion with Mexico. After NAFTA, the surplus has deteriorated to the point where we have a \$16 billion trade deficit. That means they sell us \$16 billion more than we sell them. I want to talk about what they actually sell us because that is kind of a strange figure. I will get to that in just a second.

We do not sell to their middle class because their middle class is eroding. They lost 8 million people in the middle class since NAFTA in Mexico, 8 million people. They used to pay their workers \$1 an hour. They pay them now 70 cents an hour, because there is no collective organization to help workers raise their standards to ours. There is no enforcement of the laws in Mexico to do that. There is no enforcement to keep their environment clean, or at least to clean up their environment.

"How did Europe and Japan fare in Mexico?" my colleagues ask. "Did they get locked out?" The answer is no. In fact, they are doing much better than us. Europe and Japan had a trade surplus with Mexico before NAFTA. But unlike the United States, they have maintained their trade surplus with Mexico, even through the Mexico peso crash in 1994.

On a trip through the maquiladora zone along the United States-Mexican border, we see names like Sony and Samsung along with United States companies. Asia is fully into Mexico today. I do not want history to repeat itself, because we are being given the same warnings about South America.

The truth is that we are doing very well today in South America. Our exports are up 19 percent over last year, without fast track. We have doubled our trade surplus with South America to 3.6 billion without fast track. We are not losing out. We are winning. But if we expand a bad trade deal like NAFTA to South America, I will be willing to bet that South America will go the way of Mexico and, for that matter, Japan and China.

□ 1315

After 4 years of experience with NAFTA the American people certainly are not being fooled by big corporate campaigns to expand NAFTA at this time. In fact they are very much opposed to the President's fast track proposal.

I have a little chart I want to show my colleagues here; it is a poll that was done recently. By a 2 to 1 margin the American people oppose fast track, according to the Wall Street Journal-NBC poll. Most Americans believe that trade deals benefit multinational corporations at the expense of working

families. This figure was taken from a poll done for the Democratic Leadership Council, by the way, which supports fast track. Also by a 2 to 1 margin the American people believe that labor and environmental and human rights issues should be included in trade agreements. Eighty-three percent of Americans say, "What's the rush with fast track?" according to this poll. And, finally, most Americans say that increased imports take away American jobs and hurt the wages of American workers.

So public opinion is overwhelmingly opposed to fast track and trade deals done without proper labor and environmental standards because they have looked at the record of NAFTA and they know that it has not worked. You can talk to people. There was a recent study done by the Policy Institute that showed that we have lost 394,000 jobs as a result of NAFTA, net jobs; I am not talking about just jobs, I am talking about net jobs. We have gained some jobs; net total we have lost a huge number of jobs.

I would like for just a second to address one other issue before I yield to the distinguished Democratic leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] who has been so fabulous in leading our efforts on this issue, and that is the issue of exports, because the other side like to ballyhoo the number, that we are exporting more to Mexico now, even though they are importing a heck of a lot more here.

Let me tell you something. I want my colleagues to look at a memo that I have from Professor Harley Shaiken, who was at the University of California and who has studied the economic relationship between Mexico and United States extensively. He is probably the foremost expert in the country on this. Professor Shaiken shed some light on what I would call the myth behind our increased exports to Mexico.

There is no denying that exports to Mexico have risen since NAFTA although imports, as I said, have increased much more dramatically. But Professor Shaiken, analyzing trade data, shows that the vast majority of exports growth has been in what he calls revolving door exports or industrial tourists.

Now these are goods that are shipped to Mexico as components, usually along the border with the United States and the maquiladora, therefore counted as exports but then assembled in Mexico and shipped right back here. That is why they call them tourist exports. They are not even there long enough to have a visa. They get shipped over there, they are put together by people who make 70 cents an hour, and they are shipped right back here, not to consumers in Mexico, as I said before. The consumer middle class in Mexico has declined by about 8 million people in the last 4 years.

Revolving door exports have surged 230 percent since NAFTA, rising from 18 billion in 1993 to 42 billion last year.

These exports accounted for 40 percent of our total exports to Mexico in 1993, but that share grew up to 62 percent last year.

So the upshot is, 62 percent of our exports to Mexico are shipped right back here, and these are not job-creating exports, they are job-destroying exports.

Professor Shaiken notes in his memos, paraphrasing Pogo, "We have met the market, and it is us."

You know, there are so many aspects to this issue. There is a food safety issue, there is the drug issue, there is the loss of jobs, the downward pressure on wages, there is the environmental degradation.

I visited maquiladora in Tijuana with my distinguished leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and we have some stories and some pictures that I am sure my colleague will show you right now from his recent visit to the border that really, for me, sickens my stomach that our corporations and our Government have not dealt with these questions of worker safety and worker rights and environmental degradation, and I think you will understand why when you hear the distinguished leader. So I am honored that he would join me this afternoon in talking about this issue that is so fundamental to the values which we hold so dear and which so many people have fought for in this country for so many years, and I thank him for joining, and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I will come to the well because I have some pictures I would like to show.

First, I would like to salute the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished whip on the Democratic side. No one has a greater understanding of the challenges that face working families in America than he does, and no one has fought harder to realize the interests of working families than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. So I am always deeply pleased to be with him in talking about these important issues.

Let me start today by saying right off the bat that I am for free trade, as is the gentleman from Michigan. We believe trade is synergistic, we think it has energy for everyone, we think it helps every country that can engage in free trade, and we are for free trade treaties between the United States and other countries and within the whole world. We also believe that trade should be fair as well as free, that it is not just enough to get tariffs down, that there are other issues that need to be dealt with when you are talking about a trading relationship.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1980's we advocated that there be access to foreign markets like Japan so that we could get our products into their market as easily as they could get their products into our market, and through the 1980's and into the early 1990's we were able to get those access issues to be debated, to be understood and, I think, to

be accepted by people in the United States and across the world.

Since the early 1990's, when the real debate began on the North American Free Trade Agreement, we brought up the issue of fairness as it applied to the proper application and administration of labor laws, worker laws and environmental laws in other countries, and that is because when we talk about the NAFTA, it was to be a free trade agreement between two countries that were highly developed economically and another country that was still in the early stages of development with a much lower standard of living, and we realized that if trade was to work for everybody in Canada, the United States and Mexico, it was very important that there be a greater effort at the application of national laws on labor and on environment.

Now why is that the case? That is the case because the standards we have in these areas need to be moving toward uniformity, not toward disappearing, because if you have no standards, then the lack of standards becomes a comparative advantage for the country that has no standards. Plus the fact I just do not see how anybody says we should not try to get the laws of other countries we are trading with to be properly enforced.

So as a result of that we wrote language into the so-called fast track negotiating authority that said we would pay attention to these issues, and in the negotiation, for the first time in the negotiation of any free trade agreement we had serious discussions of how we could get the national laws of each country on labor and the environment to be properly enforced.

Now at the end of the day we were not able to get that enforcement process to have real teeth. These issues wound up in so-called side agreements that I felt were largely cosmetic, and that is the reason I oppose the NAFTA agreement, because there was not a serious attempt to really enforce these laws.

Now, right now, the President is asking us for fast track negotiating authority to get new free trade agreements with, say, Brazil or Argentina or Chile or other countries across the world, and just as in 1991, I voted for fast track for then-President Bush, I am quite prepared to vote for fast track for President Clinton because obviously I think he shares my values on these issues much more than President Bush did, but I do not want again to go to a set of negotiations without the Congress being very clear about what we expect in macro terms to be in these agreements. I did that once; I do not want to do that again. I think we suffered as a Congress from giving this fast track authority, which of course gives tremendous power from the Congress to the executive branch, which I am willing to give because I understand the nature of trade negotiations, but I am not willing to give it without some overall admonition about what we expect to have in these treaties.

I do not want to mislead anyone. I do not want the Brazilians to be misled as to what we will require in the Congress in these treaties. We want labor and environmental enforcement of their laws in the core trade treaty with trade sanctions in order to enforce it.

Now when I say that a lot of people say, "Well, how can you ask another country to enforce its laws?" Why would we not ask another country to enforce its laws? How could we possibly enter into a free trade marriage, which is what a free trade agreement is, without making sure that all the countries involved were going to enforce their national laws?

Now let me go a step further. Before we negotiated the NAFTA, our business community said that you have got to insist that Mexico change and improve its intellectual property laws, and we went to Mexico and did that. Mexico changed and improved its intellectual property and capital laws, and we put those laws into the treaty and said that if Mexico does not properly enforce their intellectual property and capital laws, we will bring trade sanctions against their products coming into the United States. And what I say to my friends in the business community is if it is good enough for intellectual property and capital, which we all care about, surely it must be good enough for labor and the environment.

I just want symmetry. I want us to treat labor and environment as strongly as we treat intellectual property and capital.

Now, having said all of that, I think as we enter this debate it is important to understand what has happened with NAFTA. Some people are saying, oh, you cannot look at NAFTA, that is unfair because no country is alike. I agree with that, no country is alike. But surely it is relevant to this debate to say we have done a free trade treaty with a country that is in a state of development. What has happened there with that free trade treaty? Has it worked the way we had hoped it would work?

And so let us get out some facts about what is happened with NAFTA. The first thing you need to understand is that since 1993 the number of jobs and the number of factories on the border in Mexico has doubled since 1993. In 1993 there were about 500,000 jobs on the border; now there is almost 1 million.

You also need to understand that the turnover rate in those plants is 100 percent. The people work for less here, and they move on. Why do they move on so quickly? There is a simple reason. Wages in the maquiladora plants in Mexico have gone down in the last 3 years, not up. They were \$1 an hour; now people are paid 70 cents an hour. As a result, people cannot live on that wage so they leave. They either come to the United States or they go back to the interior where they grew up in Mexico.

Now, as a result of that it has been really difficult to get enforcement of

Mexico's labor and environmental laws which might have moved things in a better direction. You know if we really had gotten Mexico's labor laws to be more properly enforced, maybe wages would be \$1.25 an hour rather than 70 cents an hour as they are now. But that has not happened. Four cases have been brought under the labor side agreement, and none of them have been resolved. Under the North American Development Bank, which we set up to remedy some of these environment conditions, only 3 loans have been let and none of them have been completed, and there are literally hundreds of situations on the border where there is real environmental danger to the people living on the border.

Now I recently went to the border again, to Juarez, across the line from El Paso, and I have here some pictures that I think best present what is actually happening on the border. You know, one of the things we need to do as we go into this debate is have a reality check, what is actually happening with the free trade treaty.

Here is a picture of a brand new, very modern maquiladora plant, and maybe hard to see over the television, but I think people in the room here can see this is a maquiladora plant.

□ 1330

It is a modern plant, I forget which company it was, one of our major corporations. What you need to understand is the maquiladora plants in places like Mexico are high tech, high quality, high productivity, making the most sophisticated products in the world, as the gentleman from Michigan pointed out. This is not low tech, old world technology. This is the best plant you will find in the world.

But across a drainage ditch a few yards from that plant is the housing where the people who work in the plant live. The housing is literally made from the pallets and the boxes that come from the plant. The people live on the ground. They are earning between \$24 and \$32 a week for 8 and 10 hours of work a day. That is a picture of where they live.

The next picture is a picture of the drainage ditch, which is behind me. In this picture is the maquiladora, a few yards is the drainage ditch. This is filled with pollution, human waste, the smell here was overpowering, the amount of pollution in this ditch was overpowering. This ditch is a hazard to people's health, hepatitis, cholera. And here are the houses that the people live in. These are pallets, and the people earn probably \$24 to \$32.

Here is another picture of the houses. Here is a young boy up on top trying to make repairs in the roof of their house. As I talked to people who are over here, they talked about not having enough food to eat, about the children not being able to go to school because they could not afford to send them to school. They could not afford the clothes. They could not afford the sup-

plies. They said that they have school teachers paid by the government, but not buildings or supplies. So to even go to the public schools, you had to have money. So about half the kids are not attending school.

Here is a picture of washing machine boxes that came straight out of the plant that is behind where these are, and people are living in housing that is literally the packing boxes of the products they are making.

Finally, here is one of the children that we saw in the colonias. The children, as all children are, are beautiful. I talked to one young girl and I asked her her name. She said which name do you want? My right name, or the name I assumed to get a job in the plant at age 13?

Half these children are not in school. All of these children are malnourished. They are living in subhuman conditions. If you go to the maquiladoras and ask our companies why are you allowing people to live in subhuman conditions who are your employees, they probably rightly say because we are in competition with all the other companies that are here, and this is cutthroat competition, and there are no standards.

I want to say something: It is not the responsibility of just the companies to have standards. It is the responsibility of the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico to see that there are human standards for the environment and for people in these factories and in the housing that is around these factories.

It is our responsibility. So do not tell me that human standards and worker standards and environmental standards have no place in a free trade treaty. They have every place in a free trade treaty.

We must be clear if we give this power, as I believe we should, to the President, of what we expect to be in these treaties. It must include worker standards and labor standards and environmental standards that have been passed by the Government of Mexico and endorsed by the Government of the United States.

Finally, if trade is to actually fulfill its purpose, the people in a developing country like Mexico have to make a human wage so they can become consumers of the products they are making. Trade is good, trade is synergistic, trade can raise the standard of living of every country involved. But in order for that to happen, people have to make a living, decent wage. Then we will fulfill the promise of trade. Then trade will be good for every human being on Earth.

This is our leadership mission. The old debate about protectionism and free trade is over. No one advocates protectionism. The issue today in trade is how do we get human standards and decency into the trading relationship between every country in the world. We can do this. This must be our mission, of leadership of the world, so that

conditions like this for this young lady will not exist anywhere in the world.

We can do this. This is our leadership mission. Bobby Kennedy said some see things as they are and ask why; I dream things that never were and ask why not.

In this NAFTA, we must ask, in this fast track we must ask, why not? Better conditions for all of the people of the world, so that capitalism and democracy become the hallmark for everybody in the world that everybody wants to reach for.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his eloquent, impassioned, and thorough description of this trade dilemma that we face. I would like to also yield at this time to another champion who cares about these values and these issues, my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, who has been a leader on these issues and who particularly on the food safety issue has really highlighted the deficiencies in these agreements.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] mentioned and said so passionately and eloquently, and as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has talked about for years in this institution, in this body, we have seen these trade agreements, whether it is GATT, whether it is NAFTA, other trade agreements we have signed, have seen a diminishing of standards, of clean air and safe drinking water and pure food standards around the world. And that is what is particularly troubling about extending NAFTA to Chile, or any other country in Latin America, as a result of the fast track proposal by the President and by the Republican leadership.

Fast track will accelerate the dismantling that we have worked so hard to build a consensus around, clean air, safe drinking water, pure, safe food. We simply should not give up on the consensus that we have built in this country.

If you go back 90 years ago in the United States, we did not have the kind of protections of our food supply. There was a book written by a 28-year-old journalist by the name of Upton Sinclair called "The Jungle," written about the Chicago packing yards in 1906. When that book was written, America did not really have safeguards in place for beef and poultry and fish and fruits and vegetables. And over time, with the establishment of the Food and Drug Administration, in part coming out of the book "The Jungle" and the scandal that Upton Sinclair pointed out, we as a nation have moved together and built a consensus around these clean air, safe drinking water laws, worker safety laws, pure food laws. And it is something that 95 percent, at least, of the people of this country I believe agree with that consensus.

Yesterday, I think people spoke in this body, particularly loud and clear,

when there was overwhelming support, almost literally every single Democrat in this party and a majority of the Republicans supported the Sanders amendment, which will send I believe U.S. trade negotiators a clear signal that Congress cares deeply about the fundamental precepts of American sovereignty in the new global economy.

Let me outline on the time of the gentleman from Michigan, on what exactly that means and the kind of erosion that we have begun to see in some of the laws that have protected our way of life, clean air, safe drinking water, worker safety laws, all of these things, what some of the threats to that sovereignty and that body of laws that has kept our standard of living and protected our people the way that they have.

The World Trade Organization was created by the GATT agreement that passed Congress about 3 years ago. The World Trade Organization is sort of an international United Nations of international commerce, if you will, except in a lot of ways it has more teeth. Let me run through a couple of examples of what has happened under the GATT, under the World Trade Organization.

Venezuela, which was defending its state-owned monopoly, attacked the United States in the World Trade Organization over provisions of the Clean Air Act. The Venezuelans said America's environmental laws were too strong and kept out Venezuelan oil. Venezuela went to the World Trade Organization, they won, causing a weakening of American environmental laws.

Second example, the Massachusetts State government passed a bill in the legislature that said it would no longer do business with the military government of Myanmar, what used to be called Burma, as a protest against human rights violations, some of the worst of any nation on Earth. The European Union, along with the military dictatorship in Myanmar, in Burma, challenged the right of the State of Massachusetts to make such a law and said it was a barrier to trade. That is now being considered by the World Trade Organization.

The third is closer to home and more directly related to what Mr. BONIOR and Mr. GEPHARDT were talking about. And that is a dispute we are in the middle of with the Government of Chile. Chile has, in the eyes of a lot of Americans, been dumping salmon. They are a major, major world exporter of salmon. They have been dumping salmon in the U.S. market. That means selling salmon at a price less than it cost to produce it, less than the market value, in fact less than the cost to produce it.

American salmon farmers and salmon fishermen, mostly in Maine, Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and California, have said this is not fair, that they can dump salmon at less than cost and undercut American salmon fishermen and salmon farmers and ultimately take the market away from these businesses

and take jobs away from American workers.

The Government of Chile, in bringing this lawsuit against the United States, is about to, if they lose, which they have lost first round, is about to go in front of the World Trade Organization and ask for it to be declared an unfair trade practice, what the United States is trying to do to even the playing field.

The Chilean Government has hired former Senator and former Presidential candidate and former Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole to represent them. Only 10 months after he was asking the American people to vote for him for President, the Government of Chile has hired Bob Dole to represent them against the United States of America. I think it only begs the question. We wish Mr. Dole played on our team, on the home team, rather than playing on Chile's team, rather than playing on the visitor's team.

What is important is Senator Dole is representing a foreign government against the United States, which ultimately will hurt American businesses and will cost American jobs if Senator Dole and the Chilean Government are successful.

Those are the kinds of things, whether it is weakening environmental laws because of what Venezuela's Government has done, whether it is getting rid of laws that the State of Massachusetts legislature passed, or whether it is costing American jobs and hurting American businesses when Senator Dole represents Chile against the United States. Those are the kinds of things that are happening that will happen and continue to happen and happen in much greater frequency under these provisions in the fast track agreement.

We cannot continue to lower American standards on the environment, on safe drinking water, on clean air. We cannot continue to allow other businesses in other countries and other governments to try to weaken America's food safety laws.

We have seen, as the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. STUPAK, a colleague of Mr. BONIOR's, and I earlier this week had a news conference, talking about the issues of food safety. A young woman from Michigan who had seen her daughter get sick from hepatitis A from strawberries brought in from Mexico in school lunches in Marshall, MI, southwest Michigan, came and spoke at our news conference. She reiterated what a problem it is we do not do the right kind of food inspection at the Mexican-American border, and how America is beginning, because of some of these trade agreements, to lower our standards of food safety.

Few things are more important to this country than to continue to preserve and protect the world's safest, best, and least expensive food supply that we so proudly as a nation have built.

□ 1345

We have no business allowing these trade agreements to override what we have done in our States and cities and what this Federal Government has done to protect our air, protect our water, and protect our food supply.

So I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for his involvement and what he has done in leading the charge on making sure that our trade laws are written fairly so that American workers have a fair shake, so it is not costing us jobs and hurting our quality of life.

I asked the question, as many have asked over and over, why should we rush headlong into another trade agreement that endangers America's food supply and costs American jobs until we fix those trade agreements, like NAFTA, that we have not yet fixed. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his wonderful description of a variety of problems, the sovereignty issue, as well as the food safety issue.

I just want to take a second to talk about another aspect of this that I think deserves some attention, and that is the whole question of workers, American workers, Mexican workers, Canadian workers.

We have seen enormous prosperity for the people at the very top in all three countries over the last 10 years. In the United States, that actually goes beyond the very top; it extends probably down to the people who make salaries that are in the top 20 to 25 percent in this country have done quite well. But 80 percent of Americans since 1979 have basically had their wages frozen or have declined in real wage terms.

In Mexico wages have fallen rapidly since NAFTA. Real wages and productivity in Mexico, manufacturing in 1993 to 1996 are illustrated here, and as we can see, the red line is productivity. That means how much more output, how much more productive they have been, and we can see there has been steady growth in productivity during NAFTA in Mexico, but the wages of the workers have gone down. We talked about how they were making \$1 an hour. They are making 70 cents an hour, many of them children, many of them 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 years of age.

So in Mexico, clearly, as I mentioned earlier, 8 million middle-class Mexican families dropped into poverty. Average workers are not benefiting. In fact, they are being hurt by these trade agreements, and I can say the same in Canada as well where wage stagnation for most of the workers has occurred. People at the top are doing extremely well. The top 1 percent are doing fabulously well.

So what we are asking for is that everybody gets to share in this pie. Historically, the way workers have increased their share has been to collectively organize and bargain for a better

deal, for better wages, for better health care, for a secure pension, and all of the things that tend to make life fun, tend to make life bearable, tend to make life possible for a family. These things just did not happen; they happened in America because people came together and demanded them collectively.

I remember in the 1950's, almost 40 percent of American families were members of labor unions, and that was, of course, the greatest period in America where we had growth of average families. Productivity was ranging at about 90, 95 percent, and so wages and benefits were at 90, 95 percent. And as membership in organized labor bodies dropped through the 1960's and 1970's and 1980's, to the point where it is about 15 or 14 percent today, wages relative to productivity dropped was well to the point where, as I mentioned, since 1979 workers basically are losing ground or have not gained anything at all. That is a long time; it is almost 20 years.

So when we argue on behalf of Mexican workers being able to organize, to assemble freely, to form unions that will work for them and their families, we do that, we argue that not only for those Mexican workers, but we argue it for our workers here.

Now, people say, well, how does that affect our workers here? It affects them because if Mexican wages and benefits start to increase, as they did here in the 1940's and 1950's and 1960's, then the employers cannot play this game with workers and say, if you do not take a cut here or a freeze here, we are going south, because, after all, Mexico is basically economically a 51st State in the United States. We have just gotten rid of all of the economic barriers. It is right across the border.

I had the occasion a few months ago to talk with some women who came to see me, who were from El Paso, TX, a town, which I might add, was supposed to be reaping the most benefits, we were told during the NAFTA debate, from NAFTA, because it was on the border. There would be a lot of commerce, there would be a lot of energy, there would be a lot of jobs created. Well, El Paso has one of the highest unemployment rates of a major city in the country today.

These women came and they told me they worked at a textile facility; most of these women were in their forties or early fifties, some single parents. They had been working at this facility for many years, sewing, making a little above the minimum wage. The minimum wage was \$4.75 back then; it is now \$5.15. They were making \$5 and \$6. They all lost their jobs because their company moved right across the border, not very much more than 3 or 4 miles away, set up shop, and was able to pay Mexican workers, I suspect some of them probably children, 70 cents an hour.

When these women, who were displaced after years of service to this

company, went to the Government, our Government which advocated NAFTA and said, if we have displaced workers, we will help them with job relocation and job retraining, when they went to their government to get that promise, it was not there. None of them were helped; did not have a program for them, could not take care of them. So they came to see me and talk to me about this.

It is broken promises of NAFTA that are causing a lot of people to reconsider what they did on that vote in this Chamber.

I think the thing that moves me the most about this is that I wish the President and I wish all of my colleagues, for that matter the American people who are interested in this issue, as most should be, would have a chance to go down and see what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] showed in the pictures. One has to see it to believe it. It is disgraceful. People are living on the border in subhuman conditions, in cardboard boxes made out of the very containers that they put together in facilities that they work in. When they struggle to have an independent voice, to collectively form a union to increase their ability to bargain with these multinational corporations, or not multinational, regular business leaders, they are prohibited from doing so.

I visited a colonia in Tijuana and talked with a group of people who lived in a similar situation that Mr. GEPHARDT described in Juarez, and the leader of the colonia told me and Mr. GEPHARDT and others that the plant that they worked in accelerated the speed of the line so they could get more production, and as a result, people that he worked with who lived in his colonia, his village, were losing fingers and some hands, and it was intolerable. These things were happening on a regular basis.

So they decided, because they were not getting any action from this company, that they would protest, so they stopped working. And he, as the leader of the group, was fired from his job. He then tried to form an independent union and ended up being thrown in jail for trying to organize a union to deal with this scandalous situation.

It reminds me, and it should remind my colleagues, if we remember our history, of what happened in this country 100 years ago. We maybe do not even have to go back that far; 60, 70 years ago.

So when I say that these trade agreements are taking us backward to those conditions, that is what I am talking about, because the Government of Mexico, the multinationals that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] talked about, they are not doing anything to change this. So what we want to do in these trade agreements is to force them to do something, like we forced them to do something here over the course of this past century. Force

them to do things that would help develop the strongest, most viable, economically vibrant middle class that the world has ever seen.

So this is a struggle, and it is not easy, because we are up against some of the wealthiest, most powerful people in the world and governments in the world. But we are right. I am not always right, but on this I feel it not only in my head, but I feel it in my gut and my heart, and it is going to happen. It is just a matter of when and how long and how many kids are going to have to be sacrificed in the meantime by not getting an education, by being worked to death. How much of our environment is going to get spoiled? How many of our people here are going to lose their jobs? And how much disillusionment is going to be created with the 70 percent in America and the 95 percent in Mexico, or the 70 percent in Canada who are trying to make a go of it each and every single day, and who remember the sacrifices of their families and their mothers and their fathers and their grandparents to get them to where they were.

Those folks need to join the battle, because when they are aligned together, there is just too many of us, and we will win, because history is on our side, right is on our side, economic right is on our side.

I want to yield now to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who has been also one of the great champions on protecting average working people and especially the environment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for all of the work that he has done in opposition to the fast track legislation and the way that it has been handled so far.

I know that one of the concerns that the gentleman mentioned, too, and I was listening, is the need to protect the environment as well as the health and safety of American families. One of the concerns that I have had is that so far we are hearing mainly the suggestion that there would be additional environmental side agreements, that somehow the environment would be addressed in further trade agreements with other countries in the same way that it was with NAFTA as a side agreement to the initial treaty, and my concern is that that does not adequately protect the environment, that that is not the way to go about it.

In fact, what we have learned is that in the case of NAFTA, the environmental side agreement, if you will, has basically resulted in the number of factories along this very heavily-polluted United States-Mexican border, the number of factories has actually increased by 20 percent, so pollution problems are getting worse.

Also, little is being done to ensure that new facilities are complying with environmental standards. Something like 44 tons of hazardous waste that is illegally dumped by these border fac-

ories every day are not being cleaned up. In fact, there was a commitment to spend, I think, as much as \$2 billion to do cleanup along the border, and none of that money has been spent.

Mr. BONIOR. That is right. That was the promise of NAFTA: We will spend \$2 billion and clean it up. They spent less than 1 percent of that money, and virtually nothing has been done. There are a few projects underway right now, but virtually nothing has been done.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, what I think that the administration is telling us now is that they are willing to put negotiating objectives in the fast track legislation that would include specific references to the environment. But I do not believe that that is going to accomplish our goal because that will not require that environmental agreements actually be included as part of the treaties that we negotiate.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who has been such a champion on this, and I thank the Chair for his indulgence, and I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this issue.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it's been 4 years since NAFTA was signed. And for those 4 years it's been nothing but bad news: NAFTA has been bad news for American workers; NAFTA's been bad news for Mexican workers; and NAFTA's been bad news for the environment.

American workers have lost 420,000 jobs thanks to NAFTA and Mexican workers' wages have dropped to one-third of what they were in 1980—from \$2.40 an hour in 1993 to \$1.50 in 1996.

So, Mr. Speaker if NAFTA is such a dismal failure? If NAFTA has hurt so many workers on both sides of the border, why on Earth are we talking about repeating its mistakes?

Thanks to NAFTA hundreds of American companies have closed shop in the United States only to reopen in Mexico to take advantage of cheaper labor and weaker worker protections.

And some of those corporations that don't shift their businesses south threaten to move in order to stop union organizing. They tell their workers if they try to organize the company will move south to Mexico and they'll be out on the streets.

Meanwhile, those companies that move to Mexico are having horrible effects on the environment. Democratic Leader DICK GEPHARDT just returned from the border where the pollution and disease are unbelievable.

In the border region, where maquiladora plants have been set up to do business cheaply, corporations pollute at will, with no control from the Mexican Government. Dozens of medical reports describe increased disease rates, child deformity, and infant mortality rates caused by the lack of environmental control.

On the American side of the border with Mexico, hepatitis rates have risen to about four times the United States average. Mr. Speaker, hepatitis does not respect borders. Instances of tuberculosis are higher since the passage of NAFTA as well.

Companies who conduct business in Mexico are free to spew toxic wastes into the rivers and filthy pollutants into the air.

And Mr. Speaker, that air and that water does not stop at the Texas border just because it's the United States. This Congress and our President should be doing everything possible to protect our citizens. Not selling them out for free trade at any price.

Back when we first debated NAFTA, I remember people arguing that this agreement would help to create prosperity for Mexican workers.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, those people were wrong. The Mexican workers are actually worse off now than they were before. Democratic Leader GEPHARDT brought back pictures of families living in packing boxes used to ship the products they make.

And, Mexican wages aren't just dropping because of market forces. Mr. Speaker, the Mexican Government actually implemented policies to keep Mexican wages down to attract foreign investment. It is no surprise that Mexicans aren't able to buy our products—most of them have trouble putting food on the table.

Thanks to depressed Mexican wages and dangerous, unhealthy workplaces, our trade deficit with Mexico is worse than ever. In other words, we buy their products much more than they buy ours.

In 1993, prior to the passage of NAFTA, the United States actually had a trade surplus with Mexico of \$1.7 billion.

Today, we all know that this healthy surplus has collapsed into a deficit of \$16.2 billion. Mr. Speaker—under any circumstances, I would call a \$16.2 billion trade deficit bad news for our economy and I would call the agreement that led to that deficit a bad idea. Yet President Clinton and some of my colleagues want to use that agreement as a model for others.

The agreement that brought this country from a trade surplus to a trade deficit in only 4 years is going to be used again?

So Mr. Speaker, now that we know that NAFTA has hurt our workers, failed to protect the environment, hurt the lives of Mexicans, and hurt the American economy, I think we should talk about ways to fix its mistakes, not ways to repeat them.

But the administration disagrees with me, they are proposing Fast Track Trade Negotiating Authority, which has no protections for worker's rights, no protection for the environment, and nothing remotely resembling human rights.

During NAFTA, these elements were negotiated in side-agreements, which were not enforced.

Now, 4 years later, the evidence is clear, the side agreements didn't work. Any environmental or worker protections need to be included in the body of the agreement itself, not as some sort of toothless afterthought, as the administration would have it.

Unfortunately, these important standards are only included as "objectives" for our negotiators. Section 2, part C states that "U.S. negotiators shall take into account U.S. domestic objectives including, but not limited to, the protection of health and safety, essential security, environmental * * *", and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, these are excellent goals and our negotiators should certainly keep them in mind. But this doesn't provide any sort of guarantees that these initiatives will be taken care of. This legislation does not force negotiators to make changes in workers' rights; the legislation does not require any deals on environmental protection or human rights either.

And it does not hold governments accountable for the mistreatment of their workers and the abuse of their environment.

I know that the people who support the proposal say that section 2 allocates worker rights and environmental protection to the World Trade Organization. But, Mr. Speaker, time and time again, the World Trade Organization has refused to take on these issues.

In fact, in order to achieve enforceable standards for workers and the environment, 131 countries would have to reach a consensus and we all know that is never going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen that NAFTA has been a terrible failure and we know many of the reasons why. I hope that the administration will give history its due and learn from their mistakes instead of repeating them.

Instead, we should learn from failures of NAFTA and work to build a new plan for negotiating trade agreements.

□ 1400

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES RELATING TO FAST TRACK LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to continue with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] along the same lines. Even though this may sound a little bureaucratic, it is important.

If we look at the proposed legislation, it says it will ensure that trade and environmental protection are mutually supportive, and it in fact even serves to limit consideration of the environment to foreign government policies and practices regarding the environment that are directly related to trade. It limits the ability of the United States to deal with environmental issues by requiring that negotiations take place through the World Trade Organization.

My point is that if we look at the language of what is being proposed, not only does it not adequately protect the environment and guarantee that the environment is addressed directly in these subsequent agreements that are negotiated, but it may even limit the ability to do that. So it does not in any way satisfy our concerns.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has read that correctly. This fast track authority that has been submitted by the administration, I contend, is weaker on the environment and weaker on labor standards than the one that was negotiated under NAFTA 4 years ago.

I think these issues on the environment the gentleman talked about need to be in the core agreement, with enforceable standards, like we enforce capital and as we enforce intellectual property. It falls far, far short of what is necessary. That is why major envi-

ronmental groups throughout this country are opposing this fast track, because they see it as opening the flood gates and continuing the environmental degradation that we have seen.

Mr. PALLONE. What I have been doing over the last couple of days, Mr. Chairman, is I have put together a letter that I am trying, and some Members have already signed and I am trying to get more Members to sign, to the President basically saying this: That it is critical for the fast track to require that environmental concerns be directly addressed in negotiated agreements, rather than allowing environmental protection to be negotiated separately in unenforceable side agreements that do not adequately protect the environment.

To that end, trade agreements negotiated under fast track should also be negotiated to include enforcement mechanisms that should hold governments to set environmental protection. I am not saying even with that that fast track is acceptable, but I believe very strongly that if we were able to get these kinds of inclusions in there, at least we would have a little better protection and know that something would be done on the environment other than negotiating additional side agreements that really have had no impact.

One of the things I keep saying over and over again is we have to look at NAFTA as the example. I know a lot of people say, well, in voting or in reviewing fast track legislation, we should not look back at NAFTA. To me that makes no sense. NAFTA is the example that we have of what may result as a result of fast track. If the environment did not work with that, why should we believe it is going to work again?

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I found it quite interesting that when the President came before our caucus in this very building a couple of weeks ago, he mentioned on at least on two occasions, maybe three, when he was talking to us, he said off the cuff, and I could see his aides wincing in the background, and he said, "Well, if you were not for NAFTA, you probably will not want to be for fast track."

There was a reason that people will not be for fast track; because NAFTA has been, as we have said, it has been deficient in all of these areas. That is why on our side of the aisle there may be upward of 20 Members who voted for NAFTA who will be voting against fast track because it has not delivered. That is why the President has mentioned on several occasions, and I think maybe not inadvertently, but I think he would not do it again if he had to, that if Members voted against NAFTA they would probably vote against fast track.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate that. If I could just say one last thing, that is that the reason I feel so strongly about this is not only because I think it is important to have better environ-

mental standards in the other countries, but also because if we do not, if we just allow these free trade agreements to go forward without these kinds of environmental safeguards, then what happens is ultimately our own environmental standards are threatened, because it becomes very easy for those countries to lure plants and companies, manufacturing, down to, say, Mexico.

Mr. BONIOR. That is exactly what happened to the furniture industry in southern California. It has gone over the border into Mexico because they do not have to comply with environmental laws and rules. I visited an acid factory in Tijuana, an acid field that was supposed to recycle batteries, and it was a field probably the size of this room, filled with acid. And right across the street, not more than 10 yards away, was the largest dairy farm in that state, huge. And of course, the obvious problems occurred. The children who were drinking the milk from those cows were suffering and having serious health problems. It boggles the mind to think that we are not only allowing this to occur, but we have done nothing at all to correct it in this new legislation. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

INQUIRIES TO THE ADMINISTRATION REGARDING CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL TO LIBYA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, Libya is a rogue nation that openly supports, promotes, and inspires terrorist activities around the world. None of us could ever forget Libya's involvement in the 1985 terrorist attacks in Rome and Vienna airports that killed 20 men, women, and children, including five Americans. Nor can we forget Libya's responsibility for the 1986 bombing in Berlin that killed two United States servicemen. And of course, we will never, ever forget Libya's dastardly involvement in the 1988 bombing of Pan Am flight 103 which resulted in killing 270 men, women, and children, including 189 Americans.

Because of these and other acts of terrorism, Mr. Speaker, Libya has been sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council, and United States law imposes serious limitations on the ability of our citizens to travel to Libya or to spend money there.

The State Department has reported that one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] recently traveled to Libya without official authorization or approval. Against that background, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] has prepared a privileged resolution that would direct the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to undertake an immediate and thorough investigation of the circumstances surrounding the travel of

the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] to Libya.

In that matter, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] has expressed the concerns of all Members about any Member of Congress traveling to Libya. In an effort to be helpful, and in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on International Relations and in the exercise of our committee's oversight responsibilities, I will inquire of the administration what laws and regulations, if any, would apply to travel by any Congressman to Libya, and whether any of those laws or regulations may have been violated.

I will be undertaking a review of this matter. I assure the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] that I will promptly share with him the response of the administration to our inquiries.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, on September 18, I wrote the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] and told him how important I thought it was that he give a public explanation for his trip to Libya. When I received no response to that letter, I noticed 2 days ago my intention to file a privileged resolution. That resolution I read in full to this body two nights ago.

It is very important that our body know the facts and circumstances surrounding this visit. It was, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] noted, to an outlaw nation, a nation which is presently, not sometime in the past, but is presently engaged in terrorist activity in several countries.

I have again called on the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] today to make a public explanation. I welcome the assurances of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the committee will be looking into these facts.

What I intend to do at this time is not to go forward with my resolution, but I will note that if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] does not make a full and complete explanation of his trip, as I have outlined in the resolution, that in the interests of this body and its integrity, and because the American people have a right to an explanation, I will renounce my resolution next week or the week after.

I again call on the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD], and I know other Members of the body share my opinion, that he make a full and complete explanation of his trip to Libya.

It is my understanding that the Committee on International Relations, and it was from earlier conversations, that they are going to do an investigation into this trip which I hope will include talking to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] and asking the gentleman from Alabama for an explanation of his trip. I will be looking forward to that.

I believe that it is a much better forum, if it is done before the Committee on International Relations, it is done in a public hearing, and this is

something that we will just have to follow day by day. But the American people deserve and I think demand an explanation. It is against the law for anyone to travel to Libya. It is against the law for a United States Congressman to travel to Libya. The laws apply to everyone, including U.S. Congressmen.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

ON A RESPECTFUL APPROACH TO INQUIRY INTO MEMBER'S TRAVEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor because I wanted to make sure that any attempts to try and answer for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] or to describe what he may or may not have done be characterized in a way that would not indict him without his having an opportunity to deal with this issue. He is not here.

As chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, I pay special attention, of course, to those members of the Caucus. I wish that they always be represented in the right way, and whenever there appears to be a problem unfolding, I want to make sure that we do everything that we can to see to it that they are handled with respect.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] about this, and I am convinced that he simply, in the interests of his constituents in the State of Alabama, is simply attempting to have some questions answered that have been raised by people in Alabama. I respect that.

I do wish, however, that this issue not become something that is debated on the floor while in fact there is a complaint now pending in the Ethics Committee. Normally, if there is a complaint, it would be handled in the body that is constructed to handle these kinds of concerns. It is a little bit unusual to talk about some protracted debate either in committee or on the floor.

I would hope that something happens between now and next week that would cause this to be not only deposited as it is in the Ethics Committee, but discussed there. I suppose we could end up discussing these kinds of concerns ad nauseam.

As I reviewed, kind of, the record over a period of time about travel, I guess there have been some questions from time to time about travel to Cuba, even at one point to Vietnam and other places, where I think we have some restrictions or sanctions, but it has not occupied the committee or the House. If there is a complaint filed, it is taken up there.

So let me just say that I rise today on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD], to say that certainly he has not had the opportunity to have his say; that he has responded to some inquiries that have been made

in an unofficial way, I think, by the State Department. The State Department has made it clear they are not investigating him. They simply have almost a perfunctory duty to raise some questions about travel to certain areas where there may be some restrictions.

As far as we know, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] has done nothing wrong. He is not in violation of anything. Even when sometimes it appears that there is travel to restricted places, there are ways and waivers which allow for travel if they do not violate certain things, like the use of passports, money transactions.

□ 1415

So based on what I know, I am convinced that the gentleman from Alabama's actions are honorable and that he has not in any way violated any laws or the responsibilities and trust that are placed in him by virtue of his being a Member of Congress.

So I wanted to be here today to say that I respect the gentleman's concern. I do think that there is some continued discussion that can take place about how to proceed with this, and with that I would happily be involved with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] next week to see how we can move this in a fashion that we can all feel good about.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I respect what the gentlewoman said, and I agree with what she has said in part. I would say that there are many questions because we simply do not know, we have not had an explanation. And until we have an explanation, it is hard for us to make final judgment, and that is basically what I have asked for.

Ms. WATERS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, not that I am the legal adviser on this, but if I were to advise him, now that a complaint has been filed with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I would confine my explanations to the body that is taking a look at the issue, should they decide to do that, and I would wait to see how they were going to handle it, rather than trying to come to the floor and present a defense when he has not really been charged with anything, or to provide an explanation that may complicate proceedings that may be underway or may get underway.

So I wish that we would not take his lack of a response to the gentleman's request as an unwillingness to discuss it; but rather, now, I think he is put in a position where he has to make some decisions about what is the appropriate response and in what manner that will be done.

GREAT FUTURE FOR OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New

York [Mr. PAXON] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt in the minds of most of our constituents back home that the best days of this Nation are ahead of us. We have always been a nation that has looked ahead with great hope and the belief that the future is ours to shape, and I think we can subscribe to that notion today more than ever before.

I am proud of the work this Congress has done since we Republicans took control of this institution in 1994. The American people wanted real change and we have done what we can to try to provide that change and a real difference in the way this Congress is operated, looking forward, moving this country ahead, whether it was the institutional reforms we put in place on the opening day, whether it was welfare reform or immigration reform, the Freedom to Farm Act, and so many other pieces of legislation.

In the last Congress and in this Congress legislation has addressed important issues that for so long had been pushed aside and not really taken to fruition, to move those issues forward and solve these problems; whether it trying to address the problems of a Medicare system that was in financial failure, we have now passed legislation to extend the life of the Medicare system that saved the lives of my parents; whether or not it was for many years setting aside the issue of tax relief for working families, this Congress this summer moved forward with an important step forward in providing tax relief in the form of a \$500 per child tax credit, and death tax and capital gains tax relief.

But certainly one of the most important and historic things we have done is focus our attention on the effort to balance our Nation's budget. For so long this Congress would spend our children and grandchildren's money. We would use their credit cards, put the bills on their home mortgages so that 30, 40, 50 years from now they would be paying the bills for today. And in 1994, with the Contract With America, the Republican Party said right out in front of this Capitol, just a few steps from where I speak today, this party said we were going to balance the budget by the year 2002.

We put a deadline on it to force action, to force this to become a priority. And this summer I am pleased that in July we were able to pass legislation that will do just that, make certain our budget for this Nation balances for the first time in a generation or longer.

I think that these efforts will ensure that the best days of our Nation are ahead for us and for our children and succeeding generations. My wife Susan and I are very proud parents of a 16-month-old daughter, little Suzie. And every night, as she is sleeping, I look in and feel that it is our job to make certain that her future is better than the

ones that our parents handed to us. Each generation wants to be given the chance to give the next generation hope and opportunity. That is what balancing this budget is all about.

Now, the next great issue that we face, and I believe it is one we have talked about for a long time, but the issue that we face and we need to move forward on, much like the issue of the balanced budget, is the issue of fundamental tax relief.

Now, I know, my colleagues, that when we say those words at home, people grab for their wallets. Because for years when Congress talked about tax relief and tax reform, what they really meant was we want more of your taxes. We are going to sit here in Washington and tinker with that Tax Code a little bit. And we will go home and say it is better, but what folks know at home, really, is that it makes their life more complicated.

It is the reason why today 50 percent of all taxpayers finds it necessary to seek professional help, and I do not mean psychiatric help. Some may feel they need that in trying to deal with that 5 million-word Tax Code, but 50 percent of Americans have to go to H&R Block or to an attorney or an accountant because of the complexity and the confusion that that Tax Code brings to them every year.

This, to me, is as important an issue as balancing our budget. We set a deadline to get that done, to force the issue to be resolved, and I think we can do the same with the issue of fundamental tax reform, sweeping tax reform. We need to set a deadline. Just last week we started that process. I filed legislation, H.R. 2483, that would set a deadline.

I use the analogy of my school years. I know how it was when it came time to study for an exam. It usually resulted in me thinking about it the night before the exam. And I see one of our pages walking across the back of this room nodding his head. Well, my grades reflected that. I hope his do not. But the fact is that we do need deadlines in life to force us to move and to act.

By setting the deadline in H.R. 2483 for fundamental tax reform, I think we will force this Congress and this country to come up with a better way in which we can gain the revenue we need to run the Government and the important programs of the Government, but do it in a way that does not force 50 percent of Americans to run off to H&R Block or somebody else to get help in putting together their taxes.

Now, I am pleased to report that today, and it has just been a week and a couple of days since we filed this historic legislation, 2483, that 47 Members of this Congress, this House, have moved forward to cosponsor that legislation. I am pleased with the fact that just the day before yesterday, out in front of the Capitol, Senator BROWNBACK, the senior Senator from the State of Kansas, announced that he

was putting his version of our legislation in before the U.S. Senate. So now we have a bill in both Houses to sunset the Federal Tax Code and to begin this great debate.

I am pleased with the fact that this is bipartisan legislation. In this House both Republicans and Democrats are sponsoring H.R. 2483. I am also pleased that groups outside of the Congress have already moved forward in support of our legislation to sunset the Federal Tax Code.

The most important group, in my view, in America that deals with small business and entrepreneurs, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, on Monday launched a nationwide campaign in support of legislation, our legislation, to sunset the Federal Tax Code. They have decided they are going to get a million signatures across this country to bring here to Washington to lay down in front of this Capitol to say to Members of Congress your constituents back home, Mr. Congressman or Congresswoman, they would like you to move forward on this debate on sunsetting the Federal Tax Code.

They have been joined, along with the NFIB, Americans for Hope, Growth and Opportunity, which is headed up by Steve Forbes, who in the past few years has raised the issue of a national flat tax and tax reform to a national debate. They have endorsed our proposal as well as Americans for Tax Reform, which is one of the most important organizations that have been fighting for fundamental tax reform for a long, long time now.

These organizations, along with people across the country, have called in to our office and offices across Capitol Hill and are saying, yes, we want to sunset that Tax Code, we want to begin this debate on fundamental reform of our Federal tax system. We want to do for the Tax Code what Congress did this year by balancing the budget; set a goal, involve the American people in that debate, and move this issue forward.

Now, what exactly does H.R. 2483 do? It is real simple. As a matter of fact, it is probably one of the shortest pieces of legislation in terms of verbiage we could ever find. I even understand it. I do not need to have people explain it to me, which is a blessed relief in Washington to have something so short even a Member of Congress can understand it. But it is just this long. It is less than a page of information.

And all it does is say, first, that the Internal Revenue Code is sunsetted on December 31, 2000. Three years from this New Year's Eve the entire Federal Tax Code will come to an end. It repeals 96 of 99 chapters of that code.

I make this caveat. The only thing we do not repeal in there are the provisions relating to the financing of Social Security and Medicare. I do not want to touch those two systems. The way we collect the revenue for those two programs will not be touched by

our reform of the remaining part of the Tax Code that deals with all the other provisions.

We eliminate the overwhelming majority of the 5.5 million words in that Tax Code and, frankly, eliminate the need for most, if not all, of the 113,000 folks who work at the Internal Revenue Service.

We will reduce the \$200 billion cost of tax compliance. What does that mean? It means that folks every year spend in our country \$200 billion out of their pockets every year to have somebody help them prepare their taxes, keep their records they need for their taxes, get advice and consultation on how to deal with this 5.5 million words Tax Code. That is \$200 million that families will have to spend to set aside to put for their college education of their kids, maybe to take a vacation that is long overdue, put a new roof on the house, maybe some folks will use that money, instead of preparing for the tax man, to start a new business instead, to create some new jobs in their businesses for other folks to be employed. It is a lot better way to spend those dollars than in complying with the 5.5 million-word Tax Code.

Now, I think these are important steps forward, the opportunity to sunset this Tax Code, and then to begin a great national debate, to involve citizens from across the country in choosing a new system of taxation.

Now, some, like Steve Forbes, or in this Chamber our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas, DICK ARMEY, have proposed a flat rate income tax that we could fill out on a postcard about this size. We would put down our income and a few basic deductions and send it to Washington. We would not need to fill out countless forms and deal with countless bureaucrats or countless Congressmen and women to fill out our tax forms.

There is another alternative, proposed by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BILL ARCHER, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, or the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BILLY TAUZIN, or the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER, and they propose no income taxes or no business or corporate taxes at all, just a national sales tax.

Now, those are two good ideas. I am sure there are many more out there out across this country, and once people realize we are serious about sunsetting the Tax Code, I think we will be flooded with good ideas, just as we were during the balanced budget debate on how we can move forward with a better, fairer system of taxation in this country.

But there is another reason to change, and that is a fundamental philosophical one. This current 5.5 million-word Tax Code, which is enforced by 113,000 IRS folks, which is changed and meddled with constantly by 535 Members of Congress, this does more than just cause inconvenience, it limits other personal and economic freedom,

and it discriminates against children and families and entrepreneurs.

The Tax Code encourages, as I mentioned, hundreds of billions of dollars in tax costs of preparation and it also incurs hundreds of billions of dollars in the underground economy, which we never find out about and which is never taxed and the revenue is lost to the Government.

I think most of all the complexity and unfairness of the Tax Code leads most folks back home to distrust the Tax Code. I know when I hold town meetings throughout the Finger Lakes or western New York, in Buffalo or Rochester or Syracuse, New York regions, people come to me all the time and say they do not believe in the system; it does not work, this tax system, and they lose their faith in a Congress that has put this in place or a Government that enforces it. We can change all that.

If there has ever been a reason to make change, all we have to do is walk out of this Chamber and down to the other body at the other end of this Capitol and listen to the discussion that has been going on in the committee chaired by Senator BILL ROTH from Delaware on the Senate's Committee on Finance, that has been holding hearings this week, bringing in current and former IRS agents and other experts who have been talking about the abuses of this current system and how it is unfair.

They have done it in the Senate, and earlier this year Money magazine devoted a lot of attention to this issue. And they have said that the Internal Revenue Service says that they are simply implementing the Tax Code that Congress put in place. There is no arguing the current code is too complex, but any agency with the power of the Internal Revenue Service needs to be watched very, very closely. Whether it is Money magazine or "60 Minutes", the CBS show last Sunday night, or the Senate hearings, they have been underscoring these kind of statistics, which are frightening.

The fact is that more than 8 million Americans a year receive incorrect tax bills, incorrect tax billings from the Internal Revenue Service.

□ 1430

Or the refunds are incorrect because of mistakes made by the IRS when entering information in their computers. That is 8 million wrong tax bills or refunds. That is as if every tax bill or refund was wrong for all the taxpayers of Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming; 10 States' worth of wrong taxes or wrong refunds sent out by our Government. What kind of company in the private sector would stay in business very long with those kind of statistics?

The IRS has wasted more than \$5 billion since 1986 in an effort to modernize their computers. Just think of that, they cannot even get a computer sys-

tem set up to handle all the information that comes in. These are the kinds of things that are concerning the taxpayers across this country.

In fact, in a Money magazine nationwide poll, taxpayers believe the IRS collection tactics are heavy-handed, intrusive, and outdated. As a matter of fact, 34 percent of taxpayers who have been audited said the IRS acted rudely or were asked probing questions about their lifestyles that had nothing to do with their taxes.

My colleagues in this Chamber, you know and I know, we hear it all the time from our constituents, we do not need a magazine to prove it. We do not need "60 Minutes" to prove it. And frankly, even though they are important hearings, we do not need more Senate hearings. What we need is action.

I am pleased with the fact that the IRS itself is starting to get the message. In the Washington Post today the headline is, "Beleaguered IRS Announces Steps to Curb Abuses. Agency Won't Rank District Offices on Revenue Collected Acting Chief Tells Senators." In other words, they heard all the testimony in the Senate, and the IRS is rushing out to say, OK, we will clean up our act.

It says, "The Internal Revenue Service, battered by 3 days of Senate hearings into agency abuse of taxpayers, of its own employees, yesterday announced a series of steps to ease the pressures that some IRS workers say lead to the problems. The acting commissioner, Michael Dolan, told the financial committee that they will stop ranking their district offices based on revenue collected."

What does that mean? What it means is that they are admitting what we know is the case, that there is in effect quotas, that IRS employees are told, "You are going to be graded and ranked." The offices are, so the individuals clearly, it all adds up, are ranked based on what they collect. That means there is tremendous pressure to collect more. Do not worry whether or not it is fair or unfair, just go out there and get those dollars and make those seizures.

I do not think that is the way we want our Government to work. But the Acting Commissioner Michael Dolan said, "I don't come here," to the Senate this is, the other body, "in denial. The IRS is trying very hard to make a priority of serving law-abiding taxpayers."

My colleagues, that is an impossibility. The Acting Commissioner may be going in doing a mea culpa, may be going in and saying, "We are going to make some changes," but they are temporary. They will not last. We get this every few years we go through this cycle. They cannot, because while the vast majority of folks who work with the IRS are good and honorable people, they are caught in a system that is impossible to administer. They could not, even with \$5 billion, billion with a "B",

develop a computer system to handle this whole tax system. How in the name of the good Lord could they ever come up with a system that is going to ensure that these kinds of abuses do not occur in the future? They cannot.

When you have 5½ million words in the tax system administered by 113,000 people that have such great discretion over their interpretation of those rules, when you have 535 people in Congress meddling in this, and by the way, I would point out that we do our share to make this system worse. During the decade of the 1980's, Congress changed the tax law 100 times. The 1986 tax reform alone added 100 new forms to the tax system. And even the things that we did this summer which were good, they were tax cuts, *Money* magazine says one alone, capital gains changes we made, will add 37 new lines to the capital gains form.

So when we have got all this activity going on, who loses? The taxpayer. The system will never change. The IRS Commissioner can be doing this in good faith, saying, "We are going to try harder." It will not work. It is doomed to failure. I predict that if 50 percent of Americans today are seeking help filling out their tax forms, within the next 2 years, that number will rise. It will be 51 or 52 percent. More Americans will be upset with the system.

The only solution is the solution that moves this country forward to give ourselves a better future, to open the opportunity for the next millennium to be better, the next 100 years in this Nation's history better than the last 100 years. As we enter the next millennium, the next 1,000-year cycle, would it not be wonderful to do so with a new system of taxation in this country?

We began the early years of this century putting in place the current Internal Revenue system, about 1913. My bill will sunset it on the last day of this century. We would have begun and ended this century with the Internal Revenue system we have today, and we can begin the next century with the new approach.

The logical question is: What approach do I favor and the sponsors, the 47 of us who sponsored this legislation in the House, H.R. 2483? Some of us make choices and take sides in the debate: Should it be a sales tax or flat-rate income tax or any other tax? I do not. I think any system, just about any system, is better than the one we have today.

H.R. 2483 sunsets the code effective December 31, 2000, protects Social Security and Medicare. We do not touch the funding of those two systems. But it gives the American people an opportunity that is all too rare in this country, one that we are trying to do more of in this new Republican-dominated Congress: Give them, the American people, our employers, the opportunity to be involved in changing the tax system.

I am excited about this. I think this is an opportunity for the Members of

this House and of the other body to look at the American people and say, we are going to shoot the gun to begin the race. We set the goal line down there, but we are going to let you determine how that race is run.

We want the American people to come forward with their ideas on reforming, fundamental reform of the Tax Code. We want their ideas on whether they support a flat-rate income tax, a national sales tax, or some other form of taxation. But the important thing is beginning this debate and this race.

I am hopeful that this Congress will consider H.R. 2483 and our Senate companion bill this year. If we do so, that will give us 3 years to involve the American people in this dialog on the fundamental change we want to undertake. It will also give us 3 years to ponder what kind of country do we want moving into the next century.

Do we want one that is driven by Washington-mandated dictates? Do we want one where we in this Congress or bureaucrats or Federal agencies determine outcomes for our families or our businesses or our futures? Or, on the other hand, would we rather have a system of taxes that allows the greatness of this country to flow from the American people, not from Washington, DC? Will we want a Tax Code that allows entrepreneurs and small businessmen and women to achieve all the success they want in their lives? Will we have a system that will allow people to employ their friends and their neighbors and relatives and people down the street in their businesses, creating more hope and growth and opportunity across the country?

I think that this issue of fundamental sweeping tax reform, setting aside the current Tax Code with a new system of fairness, combined with our effort to balance the budget and to stay the course on controlling wasteful Washington spending, these will give my little 16-month-old daughter Suzie and children across this country like her the opportunity to live and work in what will again be in the next century the great Nation that we have been in this century.

There are many other challenges we are going to face as a country. If we can solve problems like the deficit that we have been running up, address the debt issue, which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] in this Chamber is working so tirelessly to do in his legislation to be able to pay down our Nation's indebtedness so we are not burdening the future generations with that indebtedness that we are running up today, and if we can fundamentally change this Tax Code, throw it out, come up with a system that unleashes the greatness of this country, I think the best days of this Nation are truly ahead of us.

I look forward to working with my colleagues as we see this issue to fruition.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to just say that I support fully the efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON]. I certainly was honored to be at the press conference earlier this week when we saw a man who actually dared to look ahead to the next century and dared to challenge what the existing status quo is and say, we can do better; we as a country can demand more from our Government, we can demand more from our tax collectors, and we can prepare for the 21st century now. And I think my colleague has got a great idea.

I also want to comment, though, on some statements that were made earlier by our friends on the other side of the aisle regarding what they claim are their efforts to clean up the campaign finance system.

We heard one after another come up expressing shock and sadness over the current state of the campaign finance system. And it reminded me of an old song that I used to listen to in the 1970's. It was by the Stylistics, and the song was called "Make Up To Break Up." I think we can adapt the music to that song to something the Democrats could sing, and they could call it "Make Laws To Break Laws."

I say that because here we have a group of people that have profited from what the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, *Newsweek* have chronicled as perhaps the greatest fund-raising abuses in the history of this republic, who are now trying to paint themselves as reformers.

I do not fear new laws. I do not fear a campaign finance overhaul. I think it is good. I think it is good for us to reassess time in and time out what is best for this country. But what I do fear is the level of hypocrisy and disingenuousness that makes Americans cynical about the type of government that they have in Washington, DC.

Here we have an unprecedented abuse of campaign finance laws by a group of people who are now saying, "Let us make some more laws," instead of saying, "Let us abide by the laws we already have on the books and hold those people accountable that broke the law in 1996."

The news people have told us sordid tales about how the DNC, the Democratic National Committee, laundered money through organizations and improperly used Federal agencies to help in their reelection efforts. In fact, the Washington Post, New York Times, *Newsweek*, and others have told about how the Democrats used the Energy

Department improperly, the CIA improperly, the National Security Committee improperly, the Commerce Department improperly, the FBI improperly, the office of the Presidency improperly, the office of the Vice Presidency improperly, the INS improperly, and how they use other agencies improperly, also.

The New York Times took it a step further this past week. In an editorial, the New York Times wrote that neither Janet Reno nor the President could any longer be trusted on the issue of campaign abuse inquiries. Why? Because the same newspapers have reported that the DNC funneled money to Teamsters; that the DNC used the CIA, an agency that is supposed to protect this country and not get involved in politics, but the DNC used the CIA to pressure national security officials to let an international fugitive into the White House for a fundraiser.

The Democrats wanted an international fugitive, who had already been kept out of the White House by the National Security Council, they wanted to get them in by strong-arm tactics on the CIA. This is absolutely incredible. And yet, these same people are now claiming that they are the champions of reform.

I am sure a lot of my colleagues have heard about how the Democratic National Committee in the White House made phone calls from the White House to raise money improperly, or how they had all these coffees. The Democratic Senator in the hearing said that he counted 103 fund-raiser coffees at the White House. And yet, after the Democrats first denied that it ever happened and then said, "Well, we cannot remember whether it happened," next they said, "Well, maybe it did happen. But even if it did happen, it was not a violation of the law." And yet the Los Angeles Times reported this morning that, in a bluntly worded memo back in 1993, the White House's own attorney, the President's chief counsel, Judge Abner Mikva, instructed the White House officials that it was illegal, that it was illegal to make phone calls from the White House, and that it was improper and illegal to raise money at the White House.

□ 1445

Now what do we see from the news media, the TV news media? Because there is a big difference. The print media is actually following these stories and bringing it to the forefront, but for some reason Dan Rather, Peter Jennings, Tom Brokaw, and those on the nightly news do not want to get it out.

What are they telling us? What they are telling us is this is an old law, this is an old law like the Bill of Rights. Those are old laws. The Magna Carta, that one is an old law, too, but this law is over 100 years old, so it certainly cannot apply to the White House. Jee-

pers, this law is over 100 years old. What does that have to do with anything?

The President's own attorney said in 1993 that it is illegal under this old law to raise money at the White House, that it is illegal for the Democrats to urge fundraising calls at the White House, that it is illegal for the Democrats to have the President hold coffees at the White House, illegal, illegal, illegal on all counts, according to the President's own attorney in 1993.

Why do we not hear that on the evening news? Why do they instead talk about how it is an old law that has never been applied? I do not know why. Why cannot the evening news and the Democrats be as responsible as the New York Times and the Washington Post and the print media?

I mean certainly I understand the Democrats, why they do not want all these illegalities to get out, because every one of them, every person that sits in this Chamber and goes up to that microphone, they got sent from the Democratic National Committee, profited either directly or indirectly from these illegal activities. It is chronicled in the New York Times, Washington Post.

What I do not understand is why the evening news and why CNN cannot report it the way the print media has reported it, and it has been this way from the beginning.

I do not know what their agenda is, I do not care what their agenda is, all I care about is Americans are informed, and if Americans in the end do not care that their Government officials are breaking laws and improperly using national security functions for their own partisan purposes, then let Americans have the government they deserve.

I have got to tell my colleagues, I do not care whether a Republican does it or whether a Democrat does it, if it is illegal, they need to be held accountable. And, speaking about Republicans, I got to tell Members I was a little bothered this past week when the Republicans decided that they were going to stop the hearings in the other Chamber. They were just beginning to get information out about documents being shredded, about the CIA improperly being used, but some people have suggested, and I hope it is not true, that those Republicans were concerned that the bright light of disclosure may also have shone down harshly on them.

Let me tell my colleagues, if that is the case, too bad, let it all out. Let us examine the Democrats and the Republicans and clean up the system. It is the only way we are going to restore confidence in this system.

Today the first speaker came on the floor, and he came on the floor talking about how the Democrats should be congratulated for bringing the issue of campaign abuses to the forefront. Congratulated for what? I mean that is like Marv Albert walking out after his trial yesterday and saying, "Hey, I deserve credit for bringing sexual abuse

to the forefront." Give me a break. It is a joke. Who are they trying to fool? What have they done to bring campaign finance to the forefront?

Well, the New York Times wrote in a headline on September 10, 1997, "Democrats Scammed \$2 Million To Aid Candidates, Records Show." Another front page article in the New York Times, same day, says ex-party leader admits arranging access but defends the interventions. Democrat tells Senate panel he set up CIA session, and the GOP press inquiry, says of a Democratic Party contributor, "I think it is important for us to recognize there are good Democrats out there that do want to contribute to the Democratic Party because they believe in what the party is doing."

And that is fine. Those people should not be afraid to contribute to the Democratic Party in the future, but unfortunately now they have to be afraid of it because they unfortunately were put in a money scheme where \$2 million was skimmed of their money in the wrong accounts. One Democratic Party contributor who requested anonymity said, "Whoever did this should go to jail, this is illegal, and they knew it."

Now what does the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Donald Fowler, say before the committee? He said, "I have no memory of any conversations with the CIA." This was talking about access for donors. So that is one thing they did to bring campaign abuses to the forefront.

Here is another thing they did that they are so proud of to bring campaign abuses to the forefront. This was in the Washington Post on September 19, 1997, where the headline says the United States says that Carey aides used the Democratic National Committee and the AFL-CIO consultants, plead guilty to funneling money to Teamsters' reelection campaign. And the Washington Post quotes in the body of this, which I guess again Democrats are proud to bring this to the forefront, they say, "Both the DNC, the Democratic National Committee, and the Clinton-Gore reelection committee agreed to seek contributions to the Carey campaign in exchange for Teamsters' donations to the DNC." The Washington Post.

That, my friends, that, Mr. Speaker, is illegal. It is called money laundering, and if they want to take pride in that, so be it.

What else have the Democrats done to bring campaign abuses to the forefront which they are so proud of? Well, the New York Times, they chronicle in their editorial about how the Democratic National Committee had an open door for an international fugitive, and this is what they wrote about this sordid tale of the Democratic National Committee using improper influence over the Committee on National Security and the CIA to get international fugitives into White House fund-raisers. The New York Times wrote on September 19, 1997, "He was affirming that

in the shadowy reaches of the international business world it was believed accurately that during 1996 dubious entrepreneurs could buy White House audiences, particularly if they did not quibble about the cost of a ticket." And the New York Times went on to write in their editorial, September 19, 1997, "that so many high level people even took the party's role into consideration is one of the most shocking lapses of judgment."

Mr. Speaker, some people might be asking why am I on the floor talking about this. This is not one of my top issues. I am on Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, but I would not be down here if I had not heard for a week people on the other side of the aisle beating their chest in self-righteous indignation about how they were the only ones who cared about campaign finance abuses. It is absolutely ridiculous. There is no moral equivalency here, there are no editorials like this talking about access being bought through national security people. This is an unprecedented level of abuse in fundraising, and yet these same people are trying to change the subject. They are talking about making new laws instead of keeping the laws they already passed.

I got to say it would be like Princess Diana's driver coming back from the dead, holding a press conference and saying, you know what we really need to do? We really need to lower the speed limit in tunnels in Paris, or we really need to toughen up the drunk driver laws. Wrong. You need to abide by the laws that are already on the book. Do not try to change the subject. Do not try to point fingers at somebody else. Let us look at the issue before us, let us look at the laws already on the book, let us look at the laws been on the books for over 100 years and just abide by those laws instead of making new ones.

We have more things the Democrats did that they are proud of bringing campaign finance to the forefront. A September 19 New York Times article says, "Oilman Says He Got Access by Giving Democrats Money." OK. We had our second speaker come on the floor today talking about how anguished he was that money bought access in committees in this House. Well, some of them even gave \$5,000, \$10,000. What he did not tell us was the rest of the story about how he got dollars from special interests pumped into campaigns across the country from extremist groups that wanted to write in their own provisions in environmental legislation.

What did this international fugitive that got White House access improperly say at the end of his experience? He said, "I think next time I will give \$600,000," because he was commenting, he said \$300,000 to get access but he still did not get his pipeline. So his only comment was, "I think next time I will give \$600,000."

We also have some more articles: New York Times, Wednesday, Septem-

ber 10, an editorial. They say Mr. Fowler's selective memory—now he is the chairman of the Democratic Committee, past chairman, and the editorial in the New York Times quoted yesterday's testimony yet again, abuses that occurred were solely the responsibility of the Democratic Party and not the White House. The guy wanted to say, now that Mr. Fowler has spoken, the committee needs to press further into the White House's role in running the campaign. The President is under more pressure than ever to step forward and explain how he could have let the system spin out of control. Also, those leisurely investigators at the Justice Department need to explain why they are so far behind the newspapers and this Senate committee.

Now this is fascinating, talking about how the Justice Department is behind news reporters. Do my colleagues know we do not find out until the Washington Post broke it on September 3 that the White House and the Democratic National Committee has illegally shifted soft money into hard money accounts? If we had known that 90 days ago, there would already have been a special prosecutor today, but the Attorney General has been saying we cannot do it because we do not have the information, and yet there was an administrative bungling, some would say an administrative coverup, at the FBI and at the Justice Department.

We have to depend on news reporters from the Washington Post and the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times and the Washington Times to get information because our Government is failing us, and it is failing us because obviously there is such a close link between the Justice Department and the White House that they do not want to investigate their boss. I guess I can understand that. I guess if people in my office were responsible for investigating me, I might be a little worried. It does not make sense. That is why the New York Times and other newspapers across America have been talking about the need for the Attorney General to appoint a special prosecutor to look into this.

In fact, the New York Times earlier this week wrote, "Janet Reno and the President can no longer be trusted to look into these abuses." And I think that is a sad statement; I think things have happened with this Attorney General that would even make John Mitchell blush. Of course John Mitchell was the Attorney General that covered up for Richard Nixon, a Republican who had quite a few fundraising abuses of his own. And that is why we need independents in Government, that is why we need a third party, not a partisan Republican, not a partisan Democrat, but somebody on the outside that can look into these abuses and see how American democracy was subverted in 1996 by some of the shadiest practices in the Democratic National Committee that have ever, ever occurred in this democracy.

I have a few more posters, Mr. Speaker, but two that I want to show I think lie at the heart of this growing scandal. One of them was just an absolutely shameful episode where a former White House official testified about the pressure she received from the Democratic National Committee and the CIA to let an international fugitive in the White House.

□ 1500

In her testimony, she talked about how Energy Department officials and the CIA pressured her as a national security officer to let this international fugitive in that was wanted for \$3 billion in embezzlement.

What happened was the Democratic National Committee went to the National Security Council and said we need to let this international fugitive in the White House. The National Security Council said "no." This lady said "no," and Sheila Heflin is her name, and then the Democratic National chairman hung up the phone, called Bob, that is all he is identified as, Bob at the CIA, and asked Bob to call the National Security Council to tell them to let this person in the White House.

The CIA called the National Security Council and said, "go ahead, let this guy in the White House." And to her credit, this White House official once again said "no, this is improper."

We learned later about meetings between the international fugitive and the chairman of the National Security Council, or the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. And he had a meeting with him and wrote down in his notes "Go to CIA, Bob." Wrote down notes, "Call the CIA to get this person in."

The New York Times wrote on September 18 testimony from Sheila Heflin, and this is what she said, this ex-White House official, who was pressured by the CIA to let an international fugitive in the White House, "I was shocked. I said what the hell is going on? Why are you guys working with Fowler at the Democratic National Committee?"

It is absolutely unbelievable, and I hope it is unprecedented. I do not know if it is or not.

Now, what did the chairman of the Democratic National Committee say to these investigators when they had notes that he wrote down saying "Go to CIA, Bob?"

What he said to them was, "I have no recollection of talking to him." Is that not amazing? I have been thinking for the past couple of weeks about bringing a bill called the National Amnesia Relief Act, because I really do think there is something in Washington, DC, that if you mix water, normal tap water, with a subpoena, amnesia ensues. Because I have heard more people on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight come before our

committee and say "I have no recollection of that event. I have no recollection. I have no recollection of that." Everybody has been doing it.

That is their only defense. It is shocking. It is sad. They know. They know that Americans are not that dumb, and I am surprised they continue to insult us.

This is a note that the chairman of the Democratic National Committee had on paper that was brought up at the hearings. He wrote a note to himself. It is a simple note. It says "go to CIA." That is Democratic National Committee Chairman Donald Fowler's handwritten note reminding himself to use the CIA to intervene on behalf of an international fugitive for Democratic Party fundraising.

Now, let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. If I was in a meeting with an international fugitive and that international fugitive wanted to get into the White House, and he asked me to call the CIA, and I wrote down on a note, "Go to CIA," and then I went to the CIA, and then I called the Committee on National Security, and then I get this international fugitive into the White House where I get him to give \$300,000 to the White House, I think I would remember. But somehow in Washington, DC, inside the beltway, if you mix normal tap water with a sub-poena, amnesia ensues.

"Go to CIA." It is pretty clear. "Go to CIA." That is so straightforward that even somebody who graduated from the University of Alabama like myself can understand it. "Go to CIA." That means improperly use your position as Democratic National Committee chairman to go to the Central Intelligence Agency to get an international fugitive an audience with the President of the United States of America for improper purposes.

Do not tell me you do not remember. It is offensive to be told time and time again about how these people do not remember how they may have broken the law. It is offensive when we find out on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight that 900 Americans' FBI files were improperly obtained by the White House staff by a man named Craig Livingston and then have Craig Livingston, Craig Livingston's bosses, and Craig Livingston's supervisors tell us that nobody knows who hired Craig Livingston.

I remember, I was asking him, Mr. Livingston, you said you always wanted to work at the White House, that this was the dream of your life, right? He said "yes."

So we asked him, when you got that faithful call that morning that said, Mr. Livingston, you are coming to work at the White House, who called you?

He said, "I cannot recall."

And then we asked the supervisor who fired Mr. Livingston, who said he was responsible for Mr. Livingston's actions. We said who hired Mr. Livingston, this man who improperly ob-

tained 900 FBI files? "I do not remember."

If it were not such a tragedy, you know, it would be funny. But it seems like everybody has sort of lost their memory. They forgot who hired the guy who improperly seized 900 FBI files. They forgot that they wrote notes telling them to go to the CIA, the Central Intelligence Agency, to get an international fugitive into the White House. They forgot if they made any phone calls, they do not think they did, but maybe they made a phone call or two from the White House and then they find out they made 46 phone calls. Oh, OK, maybe we made 46. They find out they made over 100, and they say maybe I made over 100 phone calls, but they are not illegal. This is an old law. But they forgot their own counsel in 1993, Abner Mikva, said it is illegal to raise money?

The White House, it is time for people's memories to be restored. It is time for America's confidence in the U.S. Congress to be restored. It is time for America's confidence in their President to be restored, and it is time for America's confidence in the judicial system and in the Justice Department to be restored. And the only way to do that is for us to stop playing the type of games that have been played this week by people that are doing motions to adjourn, to supposedly show how much they care about these campaign fundraising abuses, and instead demand that the Attorney General do what she should have done, according to the New York Times, months ago, and get somebody independent to go shake up some of these people to get their memories jarred so we can figure out why, in the words of the New York Times, access to the White House to international undesirables was so prevalent during the 1996 campaign.

It does not matter if we are Democrats or Republicans, liberals or conservatives, we have a responsibility to ask the tough questions, even if we may not like the questions. I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to start doing that.

I guess my confidence in some of these people calling for campaign finance reform maybe would be stirred a little bit if I would have one Democrat stand up and say, "yes, I too am concerned." But they are not doing it. They are concerned about stonewalling, and until they change their concern, then I am afraid America will be worse for it.

A FLAWED TOBACCO SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Speaker, what I want to talk about today is the tobacco settlement that was negotiated between the several attorneys general and several of the manufacturers of tobacco in the United States.

It was the intent of those negotiators when the settlement was reached to have Congress ratify the agreement and put the settlement in place. However, the negotiators and the manufacturers made at least two strategic errors in their discussion.

First, during the negotiations themselves, they did not include the constituency necessary to bring this matter to the Congress for its consideration. For instance, nowhere during the period of time were the farmers in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and other tobacco producing States represented at the table or represented at the negotiations.

Also left out of these discussions were other members of the tobacco family who depend on tobacco for a major part of its revenues, such as convenience stores. For those who might ask why convenience stores throughout this country, between 20 and 28 percent of their net profits comes from the sale of tobacco products.

So the point I am making is it is not responsible to suggest that Congress will take the tobacco settlement as proposed and pass it, because there is no constituency in Congress for the settlement, because the right people were not all included when the discussions took place.

Who do I talk about when I talk about the tobacco family? In this Hall, as in the other Hall across the building, tobacco is not a popular subject with a lot of people. Throughout this country, we are castigated annually, monthly, by a lot of people, some people know about us, some people do not. But the tobacco family is much more than the manufacturers. The tobacco family in the State of Kentucky are 60,000 farms of the 90,000 who have allotments. Those allotments usually are less than 5 acres, unlike the large allotments in North Carolina.

On these farms, practically for the last 150 years, people have had part of their income generated from the production of tobacco. The tobacco family also includes the farm implement dealers. It includes the feed stores, it includes all the people in the small communities. And in my district alone, some 8 to 10 of the counties are most dependent on tobacco that are in the United States.

The tobacco family are the folks who are trying to pay the taxes, not the large manufacturers who are in the top 10 companies in the Nation or worldwide, but small farms who might make \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year to pay the taxes or to maybe put their kids through school.

So these folks were not represented when this discussion took place. To give you a comparison of what it meant, since in early 1938 to 1940, tobacco farmers in this country have been paid a total of \$80 to \$85 billion for all their products put together. The tobacco settlement was for \$368 billion overnight. So it was proper that they be there, but they were not.

So for this settlement to come to Congress, representing the tobacco farmer and the tobacco family, there are certain things that have to be included before I and many other people who represent the farmer will even talk about it or definitely would even think about supporting it.

First of all, in Kentucky it is mandatory that the program of tobacco be maintained. Throughout this country, different people think different things about the program. They say why should the Federal Government be involved in subsidizing tobacco. The government is not involved in subsidizing tobacco for many, many years. What the program means in tobacco, particularly means, is you regulate in burley tobacco or dark-fired tobacco in Kentucky or flue-fired in North Carolina, you regulate how much can be sold, and you put a base or a floor on the price for which it is sold. That is what the program is.

When the manufacturers do not buy the tobacco during the marketing season, then the tobacco goes into a pool that is maintained, and that pool of stocks is then sold over the period of years to other buyers throughout the world.

Any cost to maintain that pool is paid for by an assessment against the tobacco farm and the manufacturers. The Government has no role in that whatsoever. So we say why should the program be maintained? Why do you care?

As I indicated earlier, in Kentucky there are 60,000 farmers that have allotments. Each one of these allotments has a monetary value for their farm. If I buy a farm in Kentucky of 100 acres and if it has 10,000 pounds of tobacco, a quota, that means I can easily anticipate that I might pay a great portion of the payment on an annual basis out of the tobacco.

□ 1515

Without the program, I have no monetary value attached to the tobacco, because anybody can raise it.

The second reason, other than just to keep the price paid to the farmer up, which is important, for those folks in this country who do not like our product and who suggest that we should not even be in the business, they say, why should we be involved in the program? Well, I suggest to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that with the price of the product up, the folks who are antitobacco would suggest, well, that might mean the consumption then would go down, because the cost would be higher.

So on this issue on the program for tobacco in the settlement, it is interesting, but we will have several different constituencies that are not always together supporting this issue. Those who do not like tobacco, are antitobacco suggest, well, we need to keep the program because we have to control its production, and we have to keep the price higher, and only with

the program can we have certain controls on what is put on the tobacco, what type of chemicals and so forth, because it would just depend on the tobacco from out of the United States, and we cannot do that.

So the program is essential. The program is different in different States. In flue-cured it is acreage versus poundage; in burley in Kentucky it is basically poundage; and in other parts of Kentucky it is basically acreage. So for any settlement to come here, it is imperative that we have a program, because without a program, what will happen?

No. 1, the price of tobacco will drop substantially to the manufacturer. Rather than pay \$1.90-something per pound for burley tobacco in Kentucky in November, the manufacturer will be able to pay \$1.50, \$1.40, next year \$1.20. What does that mean? It means that people in the tobacco business, especially tenants, could not raise it at all, because they only get 60 percent in some cases, 50 percent in others, and their expenses are not going down. So we would put that whole part of the tobacco family out of business.

The second thing we would do is we would basically turn over all the tobacco production to large corporate farms or even the manufacturers themselves. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those folks who have a problem with our industry would have a bigger problem if that were the case.

Another reason, when we talk about what is going to have to be involved in the settlement, is our quotas must be maintained. This year in Kentucky we have nine hundred million dollars worth of pounds of burley we can sell throughout this country; \$900 million for Kentucky alone, the largest demand we have had in history, contrary to what some people think.

If we maintain our quotas at a certain level and our prices at a certain level, then the part of the tobacco family that is on the bottom of the food chain, which is the farmer, and keeping in mind that on a pack of cigarettes, whether we like them or not, if they are \$1.50, \$1.75, I do not know what they are, \$1.50 or so, the tobacco farmer only gets 3 cents of that. The tobacco farmer is on the bottom of the food chain.

So it is imperative that we maintain the quotas and the allotments and the acreage that these farmers presently are allowed to grow, because if any settlement comes to this floor that wants to cut that, then we are basically going to hurt the farmer to benefit other folks in the tobacco family like the manufacturers, and we cannot allow that to happen.

Another thing that has to happen ties to the program. That is, the price has to have a level it has had similar to today. One would say, why should we guarantee that? For the reasons I indicated earlier. It keeps the price of cigarettes up; it allows the tobacco family to continue to produce tobacco; and in a lot of my communities throughout

this State, in the State of Kentucky, the communities themselves could not stand the devastation economically of what would happen if tobacco was no longer present.

So any settlement that comes forward must have the program in place with a level of production and guaranteed purchases from the manufacturers, because really the government will have nothing to do with this, it will be the manufacturers who will have to guarantee the purchases and at a price similar to what it is today. If that happens, then we have an opportunity to discuss it.

Now, regarding the quotas, it is imperative that our quotas in burley, flue-cured and dark-fired others be tied to the world market global sales, not just domestic market. Those folks in this country will admit, and I think I would share the opinion, that domestic sales are going to go down. None of us, whether we are a tobacco farmer like myself or like the other 60,000 farms in Kentucky, think we ought to try to encourage sales to underage young men and women. The sales to underage folks should be vigorously attacked and try to be prevented. We know by doing that, and it is proper to do it, that domestic sales will go down. At the same time, global sales are going to go up.

It is interesting to note that probably more people use tobacco products in Red China than live in the United States. So when we are talking about our quotas and our price from a farmer's perspective, we want to tell the manufacturers particularly that we want to make sure if international sales go up, which they will, then we want to make sure our quotas reflect that.

One might say, Mr. Speaker, why do that? We want to get out of the business. Well, folks, there are 90-something countries that produce tobacco, 26 of them export it, and we are not even the largest. In Kentucky alone we raise burley tobacco in one part and dark-fired in the other. In the burley industry, we raise only 30 percent of the burley tobacco produced worldwide. Flue-cured raises only 20 percent. So the point I am making is, whether we are in the business or not, somebody is going to sell it to the other folks.

My argument all along has been never try to defend tobacco as healthy. It is not healthy. Nicotine is addictive. But there has not been one suggestion on this floor, to my knowledge, or even on the Senate floor, that we ban the sale of cigarettes, not one. We tried prohibition in the early 1920's, and it did not work, and nobody has ever suggested that.

My point is, if one is going to sell it, if it is going to be on the counters, I want my Kentucky farmers to have a portion of it, whether it is dark-fired or whether it is burley.

Why is it going to be sold? Well, for selfish reasons, probably. There are \$12 billion excise taxes generated on the

sale of tobacco throughout this country. Most States that are involved in the lawsuits against all of the tobacco companies receive more money from excise tax on the cigarette sales and tobacco products than in incurring Medicaid costs. Let me repeat that. Most States today receive more money from the excise tax on tobacco products than they incur in Medicaid costs.

So there is going to be no movement to ban the sale, and if all Kentucky farmers are out of business tomorrow morning, North Carolina farmers are out of business tomorrow morning, when you go down to the convenience store Monday morning, you will find the same number of cigarettes on the counter and probably more health problems, because it is going to come from the foreign nations with less regulations than us. And all we have done, if so be it, to put the American farmers out of the business, the Brazilian and Africans and Argentines will love us, because they can sell the products and not us. So that is why, when we talk about quotas and settlement, the quotas of the American farmer must be tied to global sales.

Some people will say we cannot do that because of the GATT Treaty or this treaty or that treaty. That is often an excuse to hide behind. From our perspective, if we do that, then we can bring the settlement to the floor for discussion with the support of the tobacco family. If not, we will not support it, because we will be like an elevator going downhill, which will be unfair because the manufacturers at that point can move out of country and sell the same number of cigarettes they could from inside the country, and only the farmer, the person on the low end of the food chain, will be the one hurt.

The third part of any settlement has to be that all costs of the program that people believe are incurred by tobacco must be paid outside the government. Right now, even though we have a no-net cost system, when a farmer goes to the ASCS office or the FSA office, as it is now called, in Kentucky and North Carolina and other places, they go there to get service. Some people say, well, we should not have let the clerk or the assistant there help you farmers. Help other farmers, do worry about what everybody else sells, but if you walk in that office and talk to that person about your business, they should not help you because you are a tobacco farmer. It is not fair. That is what we hear here all the time, and it costs a certain amount of money, about \$14 million a year.

Another thing we hear all the time lately is if hurricane whatever comes in off the coast and knocks out your crop, or you get hail damage or whatever damage and it wipes out your crop in Kentucky, by the way, you should not be able to get crop insurance from the Federal Government. Everybody else should, but you should not because you are a tobacco farmer. Again, the lower person on the totem poll getting

hurt the most because of why? Because of the anger at the manufacturer; not the farmer, but the anger at the manufacturer. But they are coming to get us.

So those costs each year, we pay for crop insurance. Some years, when we have large hurricanes in North Carolina, a number of them rather, we have disease hitting Kentucky, it might be that the cost we pay does not cover what you have to pay out, so we have a deficit in the insurance program. Some people say, well, we should not have that; we are in tobacco. Never mind that when we have floods everywhere else, and everybody else is paid, but not tobacco. But, saying that, let us remove that cost.

So part of this settlement, we need to have an assessment, which I am sure will be agreeable to the manufacturers, that they themselves would pay the losses we have on insurance and the administration costs we have. Then we could remove the discussion of tobacco from this Chamber, because the only people to get hurt in this Chamber, recently on the discussion of tobacco, is going to be the farmer, not the manufacturer, the farmer, and that is unfair.

So when we talk about the settlement, we need to maintain the program, we need to make sure that quotas and allotments are tied to the global sales, and we need to make sure that any costs associated with the program are assumed by the manufacturer in order that we can remove this discussion from here, because a lot of people at home do not have time to explain their votes because they are not really protecting big tobacco, they are trying to protect the farmer, but they just do not have time to explain, because nobody would believe them.

The fourth thing we have to have is immunity, and why would we say that? Well, the manufacturers want this settlement for immunity, I understand. At some point somebody is going to try to go all the way down to the food chain to the farmer. I do not know how; we do not have anything to do with the manufacturing or the processing, we just grow it. Some people in my State look at me as being the only tobacco farmer here in Congress, and say, well, how could you grow such a thing? One of these days somebody might try to sue us if you are growing it. So if we are going to throw immunity around, let us throw it at the farmer and all the people associated with it: the warehousemen, the farmer and other people in the tobacco business, and that should be the fourth thing.

Let us talk about in case we are put out of business. Lately there has been a lot of discussion here, and what is probably the most arrogant statement I hear in tobacco country is from outsiders: Why do we not help you folks get in some other kind of business? I do not think it is arrogance because of meanness, I think it is arrogance because people do not have the foggiest idea what our business is.

Tobacco in Kentucky, as I indicated earlier, on small farms, 2 acres, 1 acre, 2 acres of tobacco will basically bring about 5,000 pounds of tobacco. Five pounds of tobacco could net you close to \$4,500 a year if you raise it yourself. If somebody else raises it for you, they would make about \$2,000, or a little less. If a tenant raises it, they have all the cost, some of the revenue, they would make about \$2,000, a little less. So if anybody tells us, let us help you do something else; after 200 years of raising this, help us do something else.

If you knew the terrain of Kentucky, you would find out that you cannot run combines over hills that go up and down or go down in the valley for 2 acres. You cannot raise vegetables and compete with people in California who have been doing it for years; you cannot get that kind of return. To assume that a Kentucky farmer would not do something else if they could make more money is arrogance, because Kentucky farmers are not dumb. They want to make more money with the least labor and least exposure as anybody else does.

□ 1530

So they tell us, "We will put you in some other business. We will retrain you." That is arrogance, especially when we consider that the same people that want to retrain us do not want to take tobacco off the counter. They want to leave it on the counter to be sold in their State, because their State generates \$600 million worth of excise tax, and they want the Brazilians to be able to grow the tobacco, or the Africans, not the Americans. So do not insult us and suggest that, do something else, it will all work out. It will not happen.

It is ironic, if we walk around this Capitol, walk around it with somebody who knows about tobacco, we will find out, probably to the chagrin of many folks here, that the tobacco leaf is commonly displayed throughout this Capitol because it used to be the currency of this country.

So when we talk about what we are going to do with the farmer in case things go bad, do not give us the suggestion, "Get out of the business now, we are going to help you do something else." What we need to do, though, is understand that tobacco in the communities can be essential, as are other things in other communities.

If we are going to enter into a program whereby the demand will decline and is going to be down, down, down, down, and if there is some way we want to say, OK, we want to get our American farmers out of the business, for some reason, I have never understood why, especially if we are going to have it sold anyway, then we have to make provision for the communities and the farmers.

What are we talking about for the farmers? It is interesting, on the other side of this building not too long ago a Senator said, "I want to buy these

farmers out. I want to give them \$8 a pound for their tobacco." A lot of my farmers in Kentucky run around and said, "Where is that \$8? Where is that line? I want to get into it. I want to find it." Some people threw around \$14 a pound. Buy me out. Buy me out tomorrow. Keep in mind, they did not say we are going to do away with tobacco. They just said we are going to buy out Kentucky farmers, North Carolina farmers.

I tell my farmers in Kentucky, I say when people talk about buyouts, you had better ask a couple of questions, four or five questions, actually.

No. 1, what are they going to pay you, \$8 a pound? \$14 a pound? Now, if they pay you that, is it taxable? The Members know it is, 20-some percent. We are already down to \$6 a pound, are we not?

By the way, who do you have to share it with? What about the tenant farmer who does not have a quota? In a program I had the other day, the first person to stand up was a 22-year-old tenant farmer on no quota, no quota, but had his equipment. What are we going to have him do, park his tractor at the barn? He would get nothing, nothing, after his investment.

We have to ask the question, does \$8 have to be shared with different people? Should there not be a program for folks in the tenant farmer area?

What about the lessee in tobacco country? We have those who lease tobacco from other people. Should the lessor get all the money, or should the lessee get part of it, because that is who is doing the producing? These are all questions.

Is it going to be paid in installments, by the way? Some fellow stood up and said, "I would like to take my \$8." I said, "Fine. Do you want to go here to this settlement? Twenty-five years, get paid \$8 a pound over 25 years?" These are questions a farmer has got to ask throughout Kentucky, throughout North Carolina, before we jump at what somebody might offer.

The next thing we have to ask, "What do I have to give up for my \$8 a pound? Do I give up the program? What does that mean?" What it means, they give me \$8 a pound. If I have 100,000 or 50,000 pounds of tobacco, I get \$400,000. It sounds like a lot. It is a lot. But it means next year, can I raise tobacco still?

Some people suggest, "Sure, if you want to raise it, it does not make any difference, we are going to pay you and let you raise it." That sounds nice. But to our farmers, it is fine for the person who owns it, maybe, but the person who does not own it, they cannot raise it at \$1.30 a pound. They cannot grow tobacco. So they are going to be out of business.

Do you have to give up the program? The question the farmers need to ask throughout Kentucky, North Carolina, every place else, "If I take this buyout somebody is throwing out, first of all I do not know why they are throwing it

around, but if I take it, how much, what do I give up? Can I raise it for my own? Can my kids raise it? What is going to be the decrease in value of my farm?"

You have to ask, "What other costs might I have to incur?" Because right now the program pays the people who grade the tobacco, what quality it is, what goes on the market, how is it sold. The program involves all that cost now and makes it pay. Farmers pay it. Are they going to have to pay more? These are questions the farmers are going to have to ask.

The other thing is, how are the other members of the tobacco family impacted? The farmer has to say, "Do you care how they are impacted? How about the fertilizer salesman down the road? How about the fellow who sells tractors? What about the person who sells a seed, or about the labor, who the only place they work in the summer is tobacco? How are they going to be impacted?"

The point I am making is when farmers are told they are going to have buyouts, or people up here in Washington keep on saying, "Let us just make it easy, let us buy them out," they are doing a disservice. They are doing a disservice because, Mr. Speaker, they are not answering the questions, they are not putting out a program that is clear. They are making everybody in Kentucky think all they have to do is line up at the FSA office and get their check. That is not going to happen.

What we need to be doing is trying to see how we are going to preserve the ability of people in Kentucky and North Carolina, Virginia and other places, to grow this product, since it is going to be on the counters, anyway.

We, Mr. Speaker, should not be trying to export an industry that in Kentucky alone this year will generate \$1 billion to somebody else. We should not keep on wanting to throw in the towel and say, "Kentucky farmers, go home. Quit. Park your tractors. Park your wagons. Forget about it. Let the Brazilians have it. No, Kentucky farmers, we are not going to take tobacco off the counters. We just want you out of the business."

When somebody comes down here in this well and makes a motion or files a bill, files a bill to say we are going to ban the sale of cigarettes in the United States of America, then we talk about buyout. Then we talk about other things.

Because that same individual is going to have to tell every State in the Union when they do that, "By the way, California, you are going to have to find \$600 million more, plus, a year revenue." "By the way," some of the western States who are paying for education with tobacco products' excise tax, "you are going to have to find so many more millions of dollars worth of revenue."

When they come down and they file that bill, then we will stand up and talk about how we are going to take

Kentucky farmers out of the business. But until that happens, there is a certain arrogance about the fact that they want to tell our farmers to quit doing what they have been doing for 150 years, because they do not like us.

Now, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that throughout this country there are different industries that have different problems internationally, different problems healthwise, whatever; none more pronounced, obviously, than tobacco; none on peoples' lips, obviously, than tobacco in this Chamber, about who they do not like.

But in Kentucky, we are talking about 60,000 farms out of 90,000. One in five people who work in Kentucky have some connection with tobacco. I am not talking about the manufacturers, I am not talking about the people, the top 10 international businesses in the world. I am talking about farmers who work at factories, farmers who teach school, farmers who do other things, and then they go home at night to the tobacco crop. I am talking about people who put their kids through school. That is who I am worried about. The manufacturers can take care of themselves.

But if we sit in this Chamber and keep on trying to suggest we are going to roll the people at the bottom of the food line out of the business, it bothers me. We are not going to solve the health problem when we run our farmers out of business. In fact, we are creating a more serious health problem, because the tobacco that is going to be imported into this country will not have the regulations, not have the supervision that ours has. It will be bought at cheaper prices. Right now in Africa you can buy a pound of tobacco for less than a dollar. Manufacturers cannot. In Kentucky they are going to have to pay \$1.90. Which ones do Members think they would rather buy?

So, to conclude, Mr. Speaker, the tobacco settlement created a lot of discussion, but it was flawed from the beginning. It did not have everybody at the table. It definitely did not have the people most affected by this at the table, which are the farmers and the families of the farmers and the communities which the farmers serve and live in.

Until that is corrected, and until we understand how we need to remove this discussion from these Halls for an industry that has been here a long, long time, that does have problems, that no doubt does have some health problems attached to it, then that settlement should never be placed on the table in this Chamber because it is not worthy of discussion.

I find it appalling that a lot of people are criticizing Congress for not taking it up, not taking it up. They should save that criticism when they have the discussion to say who all should we have involved here, so if we get a settlement, then we have a constituency to support it.

In conclusion, I want to say this. We know in tobacco country we are not

popular in Washington. We know outside tobacco States very few people like us, even though there are 30 million people that smoke. We know that if we take a vote in here, most of the time we could very well lose because of what has happened throughout the country, a lot of it out of our hands; a lot probably brought on, justifiably, by certain testimony that has happened here in the House that I cannot defend.

But we further know that in Kentucky alone, we are going to sell 700 million pounds of tobacco this year, this year; 700 to 800 million pounds we will sell at \$1.90 a pound. Math would teach me that that is close to \$1.5 billion that is going to be turned over several times.

The question I ask, Why should we not, if we are going to have this product on the counter, which we are, why should we not let Kentuckians sell it, and North Carolinians, and Virginians sell it? That is what it is all about. They do not have to like us, but they need to understand that I think in this country it is best that we take care of our own, than try to export an industry that is so vital to us for the last 200 years.

We will be the first to acknowledge we have health problems. We know that. But that is not the issue. The issue is, if you are going to sell it, we should grow it and we should provide it, not folks from outside this country.

IN PREPARATION FOR HEARINGS IN THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, what I want to discuss today is some of the reactions that we have found on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight as we prepare for witnesses at the forthcoming hearings. What Members see here and they will see in the next few minutes is 58 witnesses seem to be unavailable. We are going to break down, where are they.

Eleven of these witnesses have simply fled the country. Let us take them one by one. Charlie Trie. He was last seen in Beijing, China; a former restaurateur, old friend of President Clinton, who tried to give \$640,000 in suspicious contributions to the President's legal expense fund.

Now, we cannot seem to find him. The U.S. Government cannot seem to find him. The Chinese Government cannot seem to find him. It is dubious whether the last two entities have even sought to find him. But Tom Brokaw, of NBC Nightly News, they can find him. Of course, the Government, with all the law enforcement forces available to them, with the CIA, the FBI, all the rest, they cannot seem to find him.

Pauline Kanchanalak in Thailand had \$235,000 in Democratic National

Committee contributions returned because she could not verify that she was the source of that money.

Then there is Ming Chen, a businessman in Beijing, China. He runs the new Ng Lap Seng's restaurant business in that city. He is the husband of Yue Chu.

Agus Setiawan, Indonesian employee of Lippo, that is a major firm in Indonesia, who signed many of the checks to the Democratic National Committee drawn on Lippo affiliates. Of course, that is a violation of the law, neither corporate money nor money from non-U.S. citizens.

Dewi Tirta, John Huang's secretary when he worked for Lippo, now believed to be in Indonesia.

Subandi Tanu Widjaja, in Indonesia, gave \$80,000 to the Democratic National Committee for a dinner with Clinton which may have come from wire transfers from his father-in-law, Ted Sioeng, who lives in China.

Arief and Soraya Wiradinata, an Indonesian couple who gave the Democratic National Committee \$450,000 after the receipt of a half-a-million-dollar wire from Soraya's father, a co-founder of the Lippo Group, a prominent major corporation in Indonesia and throughout much of the Asian area.

□ 1545

John H.K. Lee, South Korean businessman, president of the Cheong Am Inc., Democratic National Committee had to return \$250,000 to Cheong Am.

Antonio Pan, ex-Lippo executive, friend of Charlie Trie and John Huang, who delivered cash to individuals for conduit payments. And, of course, we have obviously traced where they went to here, here, here, and here and just mysteriously ended up in various bank accounts for sort of a little overnight session and then off to the committee.

And lastly of the group here who have fled, Ted Sioeng, father of Jessica Elnitiarta, who donated \$100,000 to the Democratic National Committee. He is reportedly connected to the Chinese intelligence community.

Now, we also have witnesses who have left, besides the ones that have left the countries, there are 11 foreign witnesses that have refused to be interviewed by investigators in those countries where they are now located, conveniently, presumably out of the reach of American congressional subpoenas or, if there is a special counsel, out of the reach of the special counsel's subpoenas.

Now, those individuals, again another 11, are the following: Stanley Hoe, wealthy Macao businessman, associate of Ng Lap Seng.

Suma Ching Hai, head of a Taiwan-based Buddhist cult that tried to funnel foreign contributions to President Clinton's legal expense trust through Charlie Trie.

Roy Tirtadji, Indonesian managing director of the Lippo Group, sent John Huang a laudatory letter for his efforts

in money raising for the Democratic National Committee.

John Muncy, executive vice president of the Hong Kong Chinese Bank owned by the Riadys, major family in Indonesia and the Chinese Government.

And then there are the three Riadys, Mochtar, Stephen, and James. They are members of a very rich Indonesian family. Mochtar is the father of Stephen and James, and they own the Lippo Group, about which the newspapers and television stories on this investigation feature rather prominently.

They visited the White House dozens of times. They did not go through on the early morning congressional tour where you see the china and you look at the East Room and the Red Room and the Green Room. They got upstairs. They were able to sit down with the President of the United States and they have contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Democratic National Committee, all illegal.

And then there is Ng Lap Seng, Mr. Wu, Macao businessman whose company wired \$900,000 to Charlie Trie while Trie made large contributions to the Democratic National Committee.

Then there is Ken Hsui, a Taipei, Taiwan businessman who attended a July 30, 1996 dinner with President Clinton and gave the Democratic National Committee \$150,000. He has dual United States-Taiwanese citizenship.

Then there is Eugene Wu, Taiwanese businessman, coowner of California's Grand Sunrise, Inc. He attended the July 30, 1996 dinner with President Clinton.

James Lin, Taiwanese businessman, coowner of California's Grand Sunrise, Inc. He also attended the July 30, 1996 dinner with the President.

Now, that sort of rounds out the 11 witnesses who have left the country that we cannot seem to get our enforcement agencies to find, or the cooperation of foreign governments to turn them over to us; and 11 foreign witnesses who have refused to be interviewed by the respective investigative bodies within their own country.

Now we get to the 36 House and Senate witnesses who are asserting their fifth amendment rights. These are essentially many U.S. citizens here, obviously. Now, let us go over them.

John Huang, very active in this whole setup, conspiracy you might say, former Democratic National Committee fundraiser, former Commerce Department official, cleared for top-secret, who just happened to go to an office outside the Commerce building and make telephonic reports back to Indonesia after he was briefed by some of the highest intelligence people in the country. And we would like to find out just what was he sending.

Now, he is a Lippo Group employee. He solicited more than \$1 million in questionable contributions.

Then there is Jane Huang, wife of John. Her name appears on the Democratic National Committee documents

as a solicitor of some Democratic National Committee donations while Huang was at Commerce.

Then, of course, there is Mark Middleton, former White House Deputy Chief of Staff, who became an international businessman. He worked with the Riadys and Trie to deliver the bacon.

Maria Hsia, Taiwan born consultant who helped Huang organize the temple fundraiser. That was the one that Vice President GORE attended.

Manlin Fong, sister of Charlie Trie, was given thousands of dollars to donate to the Democratic National Committee in her name by Charlie Trie. Busy person.

Joseph Landon, Manlin Fong's friend, was given thousands of dollars to donate to the Democratic National Committee in his name by Charlie Trie.

David Wang made a \$5,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee at Trie's request.

Nora and Gene Lum, a fundraising couple who pled guilty to various violations of Federal election laws.

Webster Hubbell, one of the closest associates of the President of the United States, Rose law firm senior partner in Little Rock during the 1970's and 1980's, former Associate Attorney General of the United States, one of the most powerful positions in any administration, and he, of course, is now a convicted felon who received hundreds of thousands of dollars from Lippo after leaving the Justice Department.

Why did somebody pay him hundreds of thousands of dollars after he left? Why did people pay him after he was in prison? Are they trying to shut somebody up? And who are they that is doing the payments?

Well, Mr. Hubbell has asserted his constitutional right to take the fifth and not give us the answers to those questions.

Then there is Hsiu Luan Tseng, a Buddhist nun at a Hawaiian temple who contributed to the Democratic National Committee at the Hsi Lai Temple event.

And then there is Judy Hsu, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

And then Yumei Yang, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

Seow Fong Ooi, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

All of these people have written checks and they have taken the fifth so they do not have to explain a lot of it. Now, some will be probably granted immunity by the Senate committee or the House committee.

Jen Chin (Gary) Hsueh gave \$2,000 to the Democratic National Committee, listed the address as home, owned by the temple, but does not live there. So much for home.

Jie Su Hsiao, Buddhist nun who contributed at the temple event.

You can see why so many people fly to southern California to raise money for their campaigns in the East or nationally.

Gin F.J. Chen, Democratic National Committee donor at a fundraiser at Washington's Hay Adams Hotel who may have been reimbursed by Hsi Lai.

Hsin Chen Shih, Democratic National Committee donor at a fundraiser at Washington's Hay Adams Hotel who may have been reimbursed by Hsi Lai.

Bin Yueh Jeng, Taiwanese national who, at John Huang's urging, gave \$5,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

Hsiu Chu Lin, employee of Hsi Lai, who gave the Democratic National Committee \$1,500.

Chi Rung Wang, a California man who gave Democratic National Committee \$5,000 at the temple fundraiser.

Nolanda Hill, business partner of the late Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown.

Yogesh Ghandi, while receiving \$500,000 in wire transfers from a Japanese bank, contributed \$325,000 to the Democratic National Committee. Of course, we would like to know what happened to the other \$175,000. He has taken the fifth, as have all these.

Jane Dewi Tahir, college student, related by marriage to the Riadys, who received \$200,000 in wires from the LippoBank and gave \$30,000 to the Democratic National Committee. Well, what happened to the other \$170,000? We would be curious about that also.

And then Duangnet Kronenberg, sister-in-law of Pauline Kanchanalak, one of those that has fled back to south Asia, Taiwan area, attended a coffee at Vice President GORE's residence.

Maria Mapili, employed by Trie, familiar with the wires that he received from Ng Lap Seng.

Jou Sheng gave the Democratic National Committee \$8,000, listing a Maywood, CA, Buddhist temple as his home address, but he does not live there.

Maria Mapili, employee at the Daihatsu International Trading Co., which is owned by Charlie Trie. Mapili reportedly has detailed knowledge of Trie's financial transactions.

Keshi Zhan, a welfare department employee who served as hostess for Trie's fundraisers, gave \$15,000 to the Democratic National Committee. She has received immunity from the Senate.

Suh Jen Wu, abbess of the Hsi Lai Temple in Hacienda Heights, CA, immunized by the Senate committee. So they will not be able to take the fifth after that since they are immune from prosecution.

What we are after is the truth and the facts and, of course, as was noted by a speaker earlier this afternoon, we have a tremendous number of cases of amnesia, where people say I cannot recollect.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] who made that point, and I have made it on other occasions, we are very worried, of course, as many are, about the Washington, DC, water supply. With all the metallic aspects that are in that supply since the Civil War, and the distribution system has

not completely been renewed, we are worried that people that have any contact here just seem to have a great backup of amnesia and lack of recollections on some of the simplest things; like did you bring the half a million dollars hither or yon?

Now, maybe you would forget what you did with a dollar, maybe you would forget where your purse or wallet is, but I do not think you would forget where a half million dollars are. So we face some interesting situations there.

Now, the abbess of the Hsi Lai Temple in Hacienda Heights, as I say, was immunized by the Senate.

Man Ho, the Buddhist nun at the temple who gave the Democratic National Committee \$5,000 has been immunized by the Senate.

Yi Chu, Buddhist nun at the temple who gave the Democratic National Committee \$5,000 also has been immunized, and you saw some of that testimony when it occurred a few weeks ago.

Siuw Moi Lian, Buddhist nun at the temple who gave the Democratic National Committee \$5,000 and was reimbursed by the temple, has been immunized by the Senate, as has been Man Ya Shih, the Buddhist nun in Texas affiliated with the temple.

And another one immunized by the Senate was Hueitsan Huang, Buddhist nun at the temple who gave \$5,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

Then Yue Chu, the wife of Ming Chen, reimbursed for contribution to the Democratic National Committee at the temple fundraiser by money from a joint Ng-Trie account also immunized by the Senate.

Now, Xi Ping Wang, Ming Chen's cousin, reimbursed for contribution to the Democratic National Committee at the temple fundraiser by money from the joint account in which Trie was involved, immunized by the Senate.

And that takes care of most of the 36 House and Senate witnesses. There was some overlap. And now where in the world are the committees key witnesses?

Well, I think America was exposed to the testimony of Roger Tamraz, who was detained in Georgia, and that is Georgia, the former portion of the Soviet Union, now Russia, an independent, who was interested in building a pipeline. And he testified honestly, everywhere people asked him the question, either the Senate committee, where he had taken the oath, or news reports, TV programs, all the rest, he said sure I paid hundreds of thousands of dollars. I wanted to see the President. And he did. He had a chance to tell the President about the glories of his pipeline because a few hundred thousand dollars gave him access.

Now, a very courageous woman on the President's national security staff said the President should not see someone like that who was in flight and so forth and various other charges.

□ 1600

That is when somebody in the White House called Bob at CIA and said, you

know, can you help us get him into the White House? Now this is unheard of. This is the 50th anniversary of the Central Intelligence Agency. President Nixon tried to politicize it to save his White House where they ill-served the President, just as the current President is being ill-served by many of his friends. That often happens. It is no excuse. But we have got to watch our friends more than our enemies.

So what happens? The professional in the National Security Council gets overruled, and with whoever Bob is, maybe he works for the Democratic National Committee, the CIA, I do not know, but the fact is he admitted that he paid even more to see the President. Business is business. Whether he can take a tax deduction I do not know, but not under our laws.

Now Charlie Trie, of course we mentioned him a number of times. That is one Mr. Brokaw could find, but nobody else seems to be able to find. And Webster Hubbell, we know about him, one of the most powerful people in the Clinton administration. John Huang living in California, He is all over the place. Mark Middleton, a key Clinton aide, he is living in Washington, DC, and took the fifth. Then we have people living in Hong Kong; the Lippo Group; the Riadys living in Indonesia; and Pauline Kanchanalak living in Thailand.

Now where does this all get us in terms of the investigation and in terms of the various witnesses? Where it gets us is this: We have talked about the recollection problem in this town, and a lot of people have accused various Presidents in press conferences over the years of not being able to recollect. But now we have just sort of a plague on our hands, not as bad as the bubonic plague of the Middle Ages, but certainly bad for good government and bad for civility and bad for obeying the laws, because they just brazenly seem to have broken every law on campaign finance, some of which have been on the books a century, some from this century. And they just say, gee, I do not know, you know. Gosh, I just cannot remember.

And then, mysteriously, the papers they cannot find, they show up in previous investigations, either in the residence part of the White House, downstairs in some of the offices, and it is like Peter Pan to sort of flit his or her way, as the case may be, in this age through the residence, through the White House, and drops little important papers everywhere or hides little important papers so we do not find them for months.

And when our subpoenas go down for all the papers related to the White House, counsel now for 5 years has simply stiffed us. They say, "We do not have to answer to Congress. We are above the law. You cannot have it. It is executive privilege."

And when we followed them down each little rat hole that they are claiming it is executive privilege, as

they did in Travelgate, Filegate, and all the rest that this committee has investigated, we find that the only thing that gets a reaction out of them is when we say, OK, you have held us off for about 5 months when the papers are right under your desk, right under your nose, and we will just have to get a contempt of Congress citation, which does carry criminal penalties. And so, that resolution starts moving.

Finally, at 8 o'clock at night, guess what? Boxes of paper appear, and we find interesting little things like "Call Bob at CIA." So maybe they have not burned all the papers. We will be talking about other Cabinet officers down the line that have burned various papers not relevant to this investigation, but relevant to another investigation which will be underway.

And so, we have the recollection problem. And whether we can develop a pill in time and put in a couple million maybe in the budget for the National Institutes of Health to help us on recollection, and we can give all these people recollection pills, and they seem to just fade away until the heat is off.

Now, is there obstruction of justice in this case? You bet there is. How high does that go in the administration? We are not sure at this point, but it goes very high. It goes very high because this kind of a conspiracy to raise millions of dollars of money illegally in violation of every single law of the United States that relates to campaign finance, they say, "Oh, well, everybody does it." That is a lie. And we do not need to take the oath to make that statement. That is a lie.

Most Members in this House, most Members in the Senate of the United States, they conform to the laws of the land when it comes to campaign finance because they know if they violate those laws, it is an issue for their opponent, and most people will want to do the right thing.

But the White House line is, "Oh, everybody does it. We should pass some laws to do something about it." We have got the laws. We do not need to pass new laws that say aliens cannot give money in American political campaigns. We do not need to pass new laws that say, hey, we cannot use the telephone in a Federal office to make political calls for money raising, we have got to go somewhere else; like use your home, use your credit card at home, et cetera.

Now that little spin, which the White House publicists, which must take up half the White House now to explain away all these things, but I want to congratulate the American press. The major exposés so far, the House has not begun its hearings, the Senate has, it is doing a good job, the major exposés have been delivered by the print media in this country, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Times. When the Pulitzers are handed out this year, if they do not go to a number of those papers, then I

do not have much confidence in the judges that run the Pulitzer Prize.

The L.A. Times months ago put together an investigative team of people that did know what they were talking about when it came to campaign finance money. They were experts on going through the Federal Election Commission's records, and they have written a number of stories that are worth reading and will be sort of the example of fine journalism in every journalism classroom in America.

So what we need, of course, in this case that we do not have and that we did have when President Nixon's administration was under examination, what we had was a tough Federal district judge, known as Judge Sirica; and he threatened to put the whole bunch of, quote, plumbers that had gone into the Democratic National Committee, put them in jail, prison. Well, that softened up a few, and people started talking. And when John Dean was fearful, the White House counsel at that time, of going to prison, he talked.

Now, it would be wonderful if the recollection pill could be given to the series of White House counsels. No White House in this century has had a turnover of White House counsels like this White House. It is just one a year. Now are they just overworked? Are they worn out? Or maybe they do not like what they see and they are tired of defending it.

There are some very distinguished people that have been in that job. But they ought to start cooperating with Congress and obeying the oath one takes in the courtroom and the oath one takes before investigating committees of the House so we can get at the truth of the matter.

Now, we tried that on Travelgate, and we found it all out. We tried it on Filegate, and we still do not have answers to some things. Why? Because some of their friends up here said, "Hey, you do not have to answer them." We started on that when we were in the minority. They said, "Yeah, you do not have to answer to them. Do not worry about it."

When we were in the majority, we could hold the hearings and get the truth, and we did. And the jury involved in accusing people that should never have been accused of misdeeds cleared them, but at a personal expense to their own human relations, with all their friends, their family, the tremendous tension you are under when you are falsely accused, as the people in the White House Travel Office were.

And they had one lucky break. They worked for the press of the United States. Those people that covered the White House knew these were good people. And when they were thrown out of their jobs, hauled off and flattened in a station wagon one day, and political appointees and relatives of the President were put in charge, the press knew something was rotten here. And when we became the majority, we

could follow it up. Mr. Clinger, the then chairman of what was known as Government Operations, he was right. Nobody would listen to him, but he was right. And he was proved right, and the court proved him right.

So what we need is a few people that will not do their duties as citizens to start talking and not all of them, 36 of them, taking the fifth amendment. They have a right to take the fifth. Jimmy Hoffa took the fifth. There is a long line of distinguished people that have taken the fifth before congressional committees. But I think what we need are some tough Federal judges.

Now the question is, special counsel. A lot of us have written the Attorney General over the last few months to say, why do you not appoint a special counsel to look into this, to use the subpoena power, to bring people before a grand jury, to immunize some of them so they will talk and you can trace the conspiracy as far up the hierarchy as it ought to go, and it goes very high, and then bring the appropriate charges?

And, of course, the Attorney General, for whom I have very high respect, and I had met her 10 years before she became Attorney General, and when she came to this town and there was a dinner and the President would show up and she would show up, she would get more applause than anybody in the room because we had great respect for her integrity.

Now, most people have read a cartoon or two that shows the Attorney General sort of like see no evil, hear no evil, gee, I do not see any evidence out there. Now they are talking about, well, let us have a special counsel. Well, now the suspicion would be if we have a special counsel, maybe it is designed to shut us up on the House side as we are about to begin our investigation, because generally there is some cooperation between Congress and a special counsel, where we do not want the person to have revealed the situation under our particular procedures because we might want to immunize them to get them to do that, and maybe the special counsel does not think that is a very good strategy. If we can get someone to talk in the room with a grand jury, we can get something done and get at the truth here.

So there is a lot of unanswered questions. When our investigation starts under the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the chairman, we will get some answers to those questions because we have already immunized a few more witnesses that the Senate had not immunized, and we will be working on this diligently, because this country needs reassurance that the campaign finance laws of the United States will be obeyed, and there will not be a conspiracy going to the highest level of the administration to raise millions of dollars specifically outside the laws of the United States, particularly in Presidential campaigns.

Now, a lot of people say, oh, well nobody cares about campaign finance re-

form. I have heard that for years. I have been interested in this subject for 3 decades, and I have tried to do something about it as an elected Member of Congress. I tried to do something about it when I was a professor of political science. And the fact is, people do care.

That is why Mr. Perot rose to prominence in 1992. He had the right issue. That was campaign finance and how campaigns are conducted in America. People can just simply try to buy the seat. I was faced with a person that spent \$1.2 million to my \$400,000. I am outraged that I have got to raise \$400,000.

Fortunately, I have got a good group of volunteers and they raise it, but we should not have to go through that unlimited bet where several million dollars are thrown at you. One person who was a Republican spent \$29 million to seek the Senate seat in the State of California. His opponent, also a millionaire, probably spent about \$9 million of her and her husband's own money.

But we do not need to turn this Nation over to plutocracy. We need to put the lid on campaign finance. What is stopping us here is a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, known as Buckley versus Valeo. I think that Court ought to rethink that decision.

When I came here as a freshman in 1993, I got a bipartisan group of Democrats and Republicans to sign on to a proposed constitutional amendment which would permit the Congress to overthrow that kind of decision because they claimed that when you limit money in campaigns, you are limiting free speech. That is utter nonsense. All due respect to the nine justices of the Supreme Court, but that was a decision made over 20 years ago.

Let us pass the McCain-Shays-Meehan-Feingold bill, which started debate today in the Senate and, hopefully, will come over here next week. Let us pass a bill that gets at disclosure, deals with the soft-money scandals, and we have had them in both parties where political committees in the State get a lot of money from big donors like Charles Keating. You will remember him from the savings and loan debacle. Well, Mr. Keating gave \$800,000 to the Democratic Party at the request of Senator Scranton, who was a very distinguished Senator in California and has served the people as hard as he could. He made one major mistake in that area, and that was getting the money for the Democratic Party in California, legal though it was, and put his son in charge of it. I would say that is a little bit of a conflict of interest.

But that kind of money gets access for a lot of people. We have got to stop that, and we have got to close that. That is why Mr. Perot got a lot of attention in 1992 and why politicians take their polls instead of doing the right thing, which you do not need a poll to do, and they say, well, gee, people do not seem to care that much about campaign finance.

□ 1615

I think our hearings, if the networks ever broadcast them, my colleagues will notice there is sort of a black out in America's television. They do not care too much about their public interest responsibility, except for Mr. Brokaw, who has done some very good stories on money and politics, and I would like to see the other networks match NBC. They should try.

And then we see people on weekly talk shows that say, oh well, they all do it. Well, that got my wife so irritated that she wrote a long letter to one of them last week, and she had never written a politician or a journalist in her life, and that is because she was outraged by that comment. That is the White House line, oh, they all do it and we have got to reform it. Hey, help us reform it. Years ago when we tried, and yet this Chamber, the Committee on Rules when it was under the control of the Democrats refused to give us a vote on the compromise bill put together by 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans, 10 in all.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEILENSEN] and myself, neither one of us take political action committee money. We are from California. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], now chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was the head of this. Mr. Synar, the very respected subcommittee chairman on Commerce, Democrat from Oklahoma. We put together a bill that would have passed, but they knew they could beat the Republican bill, which said let us get rid of political action committee money.

And I regret to say some of my colleagues in my party seem to love some PACs because they found out why the Democrats have stayed here for 40 years; they just pick up the PAC money every quarter by \$5,000 a clip from a particular—during their election cycle from some of these committees.

Now they say, oh, we are not trying to influence the Congressmen, we just sort of want access. Now I have never known anybody that gives away \$5,000 bucks or \$100,000 that is just talking about access. They want their vote, and those of us that do not take PAC money, every night when we walk out of here at weird hours after signing the constituent mail, we all feel happy that we do not take PAC money. It is legal, we can do it, but a lot of people would love to get rid of PACs. I do not think we have the votes to do it this year, but an overwhelming number in this body want to get rid of soft money.

And what we need to do is let us put everybody to the test, and if the McCain-Feingold bill, MCCAIN being a Republican Senator from Arizona, FEINGOLD being the Democratic Senator from Wisconsin, if that bill will pass the Senate, and majority leader LOTT has scheduled that for today, Monday and Tuesday, and can come over to the House, we can have an up-

or-down vote on that measure, and if we are permitted to amend it, we got a lot of other good ideas, too.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE] Democrat, myself, Republican from California, have a bill called stand by your ad. That is to get at one of the uglier aspects of American politics, which is the negative campaign that is dumped on a lot of candidates in both parties by some in the other party, and that is saying usually twisted information, most of which is not true. I have had that happen to me. I had somebody dump \$200,000 worth of mail in the last 3 days of my campaign last year.

Some of my colleagues have had million dollar campaigns against them that have run for 6 months, and there is no disclosure. And we are determined that everybody that gets into American politics and is going to have ads and try to do someone in, let us get disclosure. Who pays your bills? How much did they give? We have to do that when we receive campaign money up to \$1,000 in the primary and \$1,000 in the general. The people have a right to know.

Well, with Mr. PRICE's bill that I am a cosponsor with him, and the idea came from the North Carolina legislature, on negative campaigns a candidate would have to spend 10 percent of that mailer or that TV ad with their mug looking at the voter and saying, "I am so-and-so, this is the film or videotape that I am going to tell you my opponent's record." Now if they had to say that, I do not use negative active campaigns, so I do not worry about it, but if they had to say it, maybe they would clean up their act that political consultants talk them into.

Now the American people say, "Oh, I hate negative campaigns," but the consultant goes around in both parties and says, "Oh, but you have to do it if you want to be elected." You do not have to do it. You need to educate your constituency that you want civil discourse, not this false charge. Like every Democrat I know seems to run against a Republican and say we cut Social Security. That is nonsense; we never cut Social Security. The Vice President one day got on Meet The Press, some very distinguished commentators were on it, and they did not call him on it. Well, I knew the minute he said it he was dead wrong, and the question was, was he lying or what? He said no Republican voted for Social Security in the 1930's. It is nonsense. House voted 75 percent, Republicans voted for social security; another one, 80 percent.

So I sent a letter to the hundred top journalists in town, that if the Vice President ever says that again, here are the facts, and they come from the Congressional Research Service, our bipartisan research arm.

So there are things we need to clean up without question, negative campaigns, soft money, disclosure. We also need to clean up who is an American

citizen eligible to vote and who is not. And we have a bill in on that which is, if the registrar wants to check their rolls, they could have access to the Social Security information. Since 1982 Social Security has kept the citizenship status of individuals. And if they cannot get the proof there, they can access the Immigration and Naturalization Service roles and they can find out if the person has been legally naturalized. Obviously there are other ways to prove citizenship, affidavits from people who have known you in the community for 30 years, knew when you were born, family bible, all that. But we need help in this situation where some of the laws have been passed so they cannot purge people from the election rolls when they do not vote in four elections.

And that leads to real mischief when they do not clean up those rolls. If you are not going to be a citizen, a good citizen and go to the polls for four elections; in California it used to be if you just did it for 2, you would have to re-register, and that means you ought to be going doing your duty and the civic responsibility as an American citizen.

So there are a lot of proposals a lot of good people have dealing with television time to be made available so people can see the debate.

Now the television stations get very upset; that is tough. The fact is they are using the air waves licensed by the Federal Government and they can certainly contribute some time, as the chairman of our Committee on Commerce has advocated this for years. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BILEY] put a bill in in 1993, and he still believes in it, and perhaps that discussion will come to the floor.

So we need to do some things just in general in campaign finance, and that is the things that are changing existing laws. But with these investigations what we are dealing with are violations of existing laws, not changes. We are dealing with the fact that the laws of the United States have been shredded in the 1996 campaign and the attitude was something of the Wild West, and since I am a westerner I recall that. What did we do west of the Pecos? There was no law. Maybe one tough judge here and there, and that is what we need in this case, and we need to get the evidence out and we need to get a few of these people to start talking, and when we do that American politics will be better off and American government will be better off.

OMITTED FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1997

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 63. To designate the reservoir created by Trinity Dam in the Central Valley project, California, as "Trinity Lake"; and

H.R. 2016. Making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

CORRECTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1997

Correction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, September 25, 1997: On page H7893, the corrected version of the Rogers amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS:

Page 51, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 51, line 11, after the second dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 51, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 51, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

Page 51, line 23, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to issue or renew a fishing permit or authorization for any fishing vessel of the United States greater than 165 feet in length or greater than 3,000 horsepower, as specified in the permit application required under part 648.4(a)(5) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, and the authorization required under part 648.8(d)(2) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to engage in fishing for Atlantic mackerel or herring (or both) under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for September 23 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BARTON of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 11 a.m. And September 29, on account of official business.

Mr. DICKS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LAZIO of New York (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of being the keynote speaker at Leadership Bufalo Class.

Mr. BOYER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of family reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOGGETT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SNYDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Florida) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SNYDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GILMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TIERNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HORN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROTHMAN.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. HALL of Texas.

Mr. SANDLIN in two instances.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. KIND.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

Mr. WAMP.

Mr. SOUDER.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LANTOS.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Ms. FURSE.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. ROGAN.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, refereed as follows:

S. 1211. An act to provide permanent authority for the administration of au pair programs; to the Committee on International Relations.

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the first nutrition program for the elderly under the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the workforce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2266. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2266. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 29, 1997, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5175. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97-993-1 FIR] received September 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5176. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Importation of Cut Flowers [Docket No. 95-082-2] received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5177. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Importation of Fruits and Vegetables [Docket No. 96-046-3] received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5178. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Foreign Potatoes [Docket No. 97-010-2] received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5179. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Loan Policies and Operations; Definitions; Loan Underwriting (RIN: 3052-AB64) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5180. A letter from the Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (RIN: 0578-AA21) received September 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5181. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Settlement of Debt Owed by Electric Borrowers (RIN: 0572-AB26) received September 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5182. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rural Telephone Bank and Telecommunications Program Loan Policies, Types of Loans, Loan Requirements (RIN: 0572-AB32) received September 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5183. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Department's Report on Improvements to the Joint Manpower Process, pursuant to Public Law 104-201, section 509(a) (110 Stat. 2513); to the Committee on National Security.

5184. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Revision of Financing Corporation Operations Regulation [No. 97-57] (RIN: 3069-AA57) received September 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

5185. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's second annual report to Congress summarizing evaluation activities related to the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 300X-4(g); to the Committee on Commerce.

5186. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Schedule of Fees Authorized by 49 U.S.C. 30141; Fee for Review and Processing of Conformity Certificates for Nonconforming Vehicles (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) [Docket No. 97-046; Notice 2] (RIN: 2127-AG73) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5187. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Primary Aluminum Reduction Plants [IL-64-2-5807; FRL-5898-5] (RIN: 2060-AE76) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5188. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 14-97 for U.S. involvement with Australia in a Project on MSX Satellite Trials, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

5189. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "District's Purchase of Presidential Inaugural Tickets," pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5190. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the report on cases completed by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board in FY 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5191. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, the U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 1997, through March 31, 1997 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; (H. Doc. No. 105-136); to the Committee on House Oversight and ordered to be printed.

5192. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson Act Provisions; Appointment of Regional Fishery Management Council Members [I.D. 032797B] (RIN: 0648-AJ95) received September 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5193. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 961126334-7025-02; I.D. 091997A] received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5194. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Literacy Program [BOP-1036-I] (RIN: 1120-AA33) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5195. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Inmate Discipline and Good Conduct Time [BOP-1040-F] (RIN: 1120-AA34) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5196. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Good Conduct Time [BOP-1032-I] (RIN: 1120-AA62) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5197. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Regulated Navigation Area: Miami, FL (Coast Guard) [CGD07-97-019] (RIN: 2115-AE84) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5198. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Manchester Harbor, MA (Coast Guard) [CGD01-97-022] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5199. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Head of the Licking Regatta Licking River Mile 0.0-3.5, Newport, Kentucky (Coast Guard) [CGD08-97-039] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5200. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; 1997 Galveston Offshore Powerboat Festival, Galveston, TX (Coast Guard) [CGD8-97-038] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5201. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulation; Commencement Bay Maritime Festival Tugboat Races, Commencement Bay, Tacoma, WA [CGD13-97-027] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5202. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technical Amendments; Organizational Changes; Miscellaneous Editorial Changes and Conforming Amendments (Coast Guard) [CGD 97-057] (RIN: 215-ZZ02) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5203. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Harmonization with International Safety Standards (Coast Guard) [CGD 95-028] (RIN: 2115-AF10) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5204. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Small Passenger Vessel Inspection and Certification (Coast Guard) [CGD 85-080] (RIN: 2115-AC22) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5205. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulated Navigation Area; Egmont Channel, Tampa Bay, FL (Coast Guard) [COTP Tampa 97-046] (RIN: 2115-AE84) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5206. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Motor Carrier Transportation; Technical Amendments (Federal Highway Administration) (RIN: 2125-AE23) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5207. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Provision of Health Care

to Vietnam Veterans' Children with Spina Bifida (RIN: 2900-A165) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5208. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Monetary Allowance Under 38 U.S.C. 1805 for a Child Suffering from Spina Bifida Who is a Child of a Vietnam Veteran (RIN: 2900-A170) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5209. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Provision of Vocational Training and Rehabilitation to Vietnam Veterans' Children with Spina Bifida (RIN: 2900-A172) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5210. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, First-out Inventories [Revenue Ruling 97-42] received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5211. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Available Unit Rule [TD 8732] (RIN: 1545-AT60) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5212. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Requirements incident to adoption and use of LIFO inventory method [Rev. Proc. 97-44] received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5213. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Section 42(d)(5) Federal Grants [TD 8731] (RIN: 1545-AU92) received September 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5214. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Artifacts from Mali [T.D. 97-80] (RIN: 1515-AC22) received September 22, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McDADE: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2203. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-271). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2487. A bill to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the child support enforcement program and thereby increase the financial stability of single parent families including those attempting to leave welfare; with an amendment (Rept. 105-272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2165. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of FERC Project Number 3862 in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes

(Rept. 105-273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1262. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Securities and Exchange Commission for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2472. A bill to extend certain programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Rept. 105-275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2562. A bill to promote accuracy in the determination of amounts of private pension plan benefits and contributions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DUNN of Washington (for herself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WELLER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. DANNER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. ENSIGN):

H.R. 2563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restrict the authority to examine books and witnesses for purposes of tax administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDEN (for himself, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2564. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 450 North Centre Street in Pottsville, Pennsylvania, as the "Peter J. McCloskey Postal Facility"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina):

H.R. 2565. A bill to require the establishment of a research and grant program for the eradication or control of *Pfiesteria piscicida* and other aquatic toxins; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Resources, Commerce, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MORELLA:

H.R. 2566. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to expand the class of individuals under the Civil Service Retirement System eligible to elect the option under which the deposit which is normally required in connection with a refund previously taken may instead be made up through an actuarially equivalent annuity reduction; to the

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 2567. A bill to ensure the equitable treatment of graduates of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences of the Class of 1987; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KLUG, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. WELLER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. EWING, Mr. LEACH, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 2568. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to take into account newly developed renewable energy-based fuels and to equalize alternative fuel vehicle acquisition incentives to increase the flexibility of controlled fleet owners and operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BALDACCIO:

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate to compile and make available to the public the names of candidates for election to the House of Representatives and the Senate who agree to conduct campaigns in accordance with a Code of Election Ethics; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 246. Resolution expressing the sense of the House denouncing and rejecting a resolution adopted by Foreign Ministers of the Arab League urging the easing of United Nations sanctions against Libya which were imposed because of Libya's refusal to surrender individuals on its territory who are wanted in connection with the 1988 terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. SALMON):

H. Res. 247. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit smoking in rooms and corridors leading to the House floor and in the Rayburn room; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HORN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H. Res. 248. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that India should be a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BLILEY introduced a bill (H.R. 2569) for the relief of Maria Dos Anjos Pires Soares; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 51: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 306: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 598: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. HEFLEY.
H.R. 631: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 777: Mr. LUTHER and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 900: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 910: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 953: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 955: Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 979: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 983: Mr. TOWNS and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 991: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1025: Mr. MILLER of California.
H.R. 1060: Mr. RILEY.
H.R. 1063: Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 1114: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 1126: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1202: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1232: Mr. RUSH and Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 1283: Mr. KASICH and Mr. BONO.
H.R. 1285: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1373: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1411: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1521: Mr. WALSH and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 1534: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1679: Mr. KANJORSKI.
H.R. 1689: Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1788: Mr. THOMPSON.
H.R. 1839: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FORD, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 1846: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1872: Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1909: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, and Ms. DUNN of Washington.

H.R. 1967: Mr. BRYANT.
H.R. 1984: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1995: Mr. VENTO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 2004: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2021: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 2053: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2183: Mr. RIGGS.
H.R. 2202: Mr. BASS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SABO, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 2211: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2281: Mr. BONO.
H.R. 2327: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. EWING, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ADAM SMITH of

Washington, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FORD, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 2357: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2358: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2373: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CALAHAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mrs. NORTUP, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 2377: Mr. STUMP, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 2397: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2438: Mr. CRAPO, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. RILEY, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 2462: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 2483: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. POMBO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BRADY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.

H.R. 2503: Mr. FROST, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 2527: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H. Res. 224: Mr. BONO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. PICKERING.

H. Res. 235: Mr. BAKER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. PEASE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BENTSEN, and Ms. STABENOW.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 15 by Mr. BONILLA on House Resolution 466: Duncan Hunter, J. Dennis Hastert, Mel Hancock, and Jon Christenson.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 28: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Beaver Creek Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 29: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Big Thicket Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 30: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Carolinian-South Atlantic Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 31: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Cascade Head Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 32: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Central Gulf Coastal Plain Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 33: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Central Plains Experimental Range Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 34: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Coram Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 35: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Desert Experimental Range Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 36: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Fraser Experimental Forest Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 37: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Guanica Commonwealth Forest Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 38: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Hubbard Brook Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 39: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Jornada Experimental Range Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 40: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Konza Prairie Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 41: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Land Between the Lakes Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 42: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Luquillo Experimental Forest Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 43: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Niwot Ridge Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 44: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Olympic Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 45: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Organ Pipe Cactus Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 46: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to San Dimas Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 47: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to San Joaquin Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 48: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Southern Appalachian Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 49: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Stanislaus-Tuolumne Biosphere Reserve.”

H.R. 901

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 50: On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to Virginia Coast Biosphere Reserve.”